

City of Harrisonburg, Virginia  
**Consolidated Plan**

Strategic Plan for years FY 2005 through FY 2007  
and  
Annual Action Plan for year FY 2005

ORIGINAL SUBMITTAL

Presented to  
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
St. Louis Office of Community Planning and Development

July 14, 2004

## Application For Funds From U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Replaces SF424: [Application for Federal Assistance](#), when submitted electronically. However, until further notice, an original signed hardcopy of the SF424 must be provided to the local HUD CPD office. This module will most likely be absorbed by the E-Grants process by the end of FY05.

### A. Submission

Submission type is ([choose one of the three below](#)):

1. ☒ **Strategic Plan with Annual Action Plan**

- a. [Period covered in years is](#): 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5 ☐  
b. Timeframe covered (mm/dd/yr) is from 7/1/04 to 6/30/07.  
c. Submission date (Note: no submissions accepted from 8/16 to 11/14): 7/14/04  
d. Type of Submission (Check one in each of the two columns below):  

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Abbreviated Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment: Minor	
<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Amendment: Substantial</a>	

2. ☐ **Annual Action Plan only**

- a. Timeframe covered (mm/dd/yr) is from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
b. Year of Strategic Plan period for this submission: 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐

3. ☐ [Annual Performance Report](#)

- a. Timeframe covered (mm/dd/yr) is from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
b. Year of Strategic Plan period for this submission: 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐

4.	Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers	Assistance Titles	Amounts of Application Requests
	14-218	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	\$ \$648,000
		<input type="checkbox"/> HOME Investment Partnership Act Grant (HOME)	\$
		<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG)	\$
		<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids (HOPWA)	\$

## B. Applicant

1. Name: City of Harrisonburg
2. Identifier: B-04-MC-51-0029
3. Employer Identification Number (EIN): 546001343
4. DUNS number: 070423694

5. *Applicant is (choose one):*

- ☒ Local Government: City  
☐ Local Government: County  
☐ Consortia  
☐ State  
☐ District of Columbia

6. U.S. Senators *(list both)*: John Warner George Allen

7. Names of Members of Congress for this jurisdiction  
**Robert Goodlatte**

Congressional Districts  
**6th**

## 8. Applicant/Grantee Representative:

Name: Kimberly Alexander  
Title: Block Grant Coordinator  
Telephone Number: 540-432-7701

## 9. Certification

"To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this application are true and correct, the document has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant, and the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if the assistance is awarded."

Signed (enter PIN):

Date signed:

10. Contact Person for matters involving this application:

Name: Kurt D. Hodgen

Title: Assistant City Manager

Telephone Number: 540-432-7701

Fax Number: 540-432-7778

E-mail Address: kurth@ci.harrisonburg.va.us

**C. For HUD Use Only**

1. Is applicant delinquent on any Federal debt? ☐ yes ☐ no

2. Is application subject to review by State Executive Order 12372 process?

☐ Yes.

This application was made available to the E.O. 12372 process for review on (date):

☐ No. This program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

☐ N/A. This program has not been selected by the State for review.

3. Date Plan submitted

4. Date Plan Review due ([45 days from HUD CPD receipt](#))

5. Date Plan Review completed

6. Plan approved ☐ yes Date

or

☐ no Date

Extension granted ☐ yes ☐ no Date

Quantity of days extended

Explanation

Date Grantee signed off

Date HUD signed off

Recommended actions

7. Reviewing offices (check those that will be reviewing):

- |                               |                                         |                                |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> FOD  | <input type="checkbox"/> CPD Relocation | <input type="checkbox"/> IG    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FHEO | <input type="checkbox"/> CPD FA         | <input type="checkbox"/> OGC   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SF   | <input type="checkbox"/> CPD CPS        | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MF   | <input type="checkbox"/> CPD EO         |                                |

8. Check any of the following that have been included in this submission:

☐ **SF 424 in original signed hardcopy format**

**Certifications**

☐ Electronic version                      ☐ Original signed hardcopy

**Maps**

☐ Electronic version                      ☐ Original signed hardcopy

**Databases**

☐ Electronic version                      ☐ Original signed hardcopy

☐ [Public comments](#)

☐ [Replies to public comments](#)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	7
Strategic Plan	8
Housing Needs	9
Housing Market Analysis	20
Homeless Individuals	37
Homeless Families	37
Non-homeless Needs	39
Community Development Needs	44
Strategies for Addressing Needs	45
Annual Action Plan	50
Narratives	55
Appendices	

## II. Executive Summary

The Consolidated Plan was developed by the City in conformance with HUD requirements for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) entitlement communities. The purpose of the Plan is to take a comprehensive look at the City's housing and community development needs and identify priority needs and how those needs could be met with CDBG and other federal funds. The Plan also provides a basis for assessment of annual progress in meeting identified needs. This Plan will cover the City's first three years as an entitlement community.

In developing the Plan, the City used Census information, housing market data, and information provided by numerous local agencies serving low and moderate income clients. This summary is intended to provide an overview of the issues addressed in the Plan.

The Plan evaluates housing needs of three categories of owners and renters -- extremely low income (0-30% of median), low-income (51-80% of median), and moderate income (81-99% of median). Additionally, special housing needs of the elderly and other subpopulations are also assessed. Based on the information collected, it appears that these are the most significant housing related needs:

- Rehabilitation of public housing units;
- Transitional housing;
- Demand for single floor rental units for the elderly;
- Demand for 1 and 2 bedroom rental units;
- Elimination of accessibility barriers for elderly and disabled;
- Rental rehabilitation projects to benefit the very lowest-income households, especially large families, and 2-4 person households;
- Additional rent assistance for extremely low-income families;
- Owner-occupied rehabilitation especially for low and extremely low-income households;
- Assistance to low- and moderate-income renters for home purchase; and
- Revitalization of older neighborhoods.

The Plan evaluates the condition and adequacy of the housing supply. There appears to be a demand for affordable rental housing units, and much of the housing stock that is available is in need of rehabilitation. The units owned by the Housing Authority are among those in need of rehabilitation. Homeless facilities appear to be sufficient to meet the needs of the temporarily homeless, although in some cases there are not enough facilities to house all homeless families together. Additionally, the need for transitional housing has been identified. The condition of the City's older housing stock should be addressed, and this could be done as part of an overall neighborhood revitalization strategy which would also include investment in public infrastructure, amenities and services. The City does not feel that any local policies exist which would constitute a barrier to affordable housing; discussions with the Housing Authority confirm this. City staff has taken and will continue to take actions to better coordinate CDBG funded activities with activities and programs of other agencies.

The plan also addresses projects that may be undertaken over the upcoming 3 year plan period relative to CDBG funding of non-housing related activities including, but not limited to, public services, economic development, community / public facilities and infrastructure development, and planning and administration activities. The most significant non-housing community development needs are as follows:

- Health Care Services;
- Dental Services;
- Child Care;
- Transportation Services;
- Sidewalks & Pedestrian Infrastructure (especially sidewalk improvements to business districts from elderly / disabled housing units);
- Homeless/Emergency Services
- Job Creation/Retention;
- Recreational Services (especially youth services);
- Parks & Playgrounds;
- Disabled Services; and
- Employment Services & Job Training.

Copies of the Consolidated Plan are available for a 30 day public comment and review period beginning June 8, 2004 at the City Manager's Office, 345 South Main Street, Harrisonburg between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday thru Friday, and at the reference desk at the Massanutten Regional Library. It is also posted on the Harrisonburg Web site at [www.ci.harrisonburg.va.us](http://www.ci.harrisonburg.va.us). Comments can be submitted in writing to the City Manager's Office, ATTN: Consolidated Plan, 345 South Main Street, Harrisonburg, VA 22801 or by calling (540) 432-7701.

### **III. Strategic Plan (for 3-5 year period)**

#### **A. Mission**

The City of Harrisonburg will build strong, accessible, healthy neighborhoods with safe streets and thriving economies so that all individuals and families have an opportunity to attain and maintain, to the best of their abilities, independent, self-sufficient lives. The City will protect and enhance the health, safety and general welfare of its citizens, and seek to address their community development needs, concerns, and problems.



## **B. Needs and Goals**

### **1. Housing (Needs/demand)**

#### **ESTIMATE OF SIGNIFICANT CURRENT NEEDS BY FAMILY TYPE AND TENURE**

##### **Extremely Low-Income Households**

Extremely low-income households are those with an annual income below 30% of the median income for the City. Based on the 2000 median household income of \$29,949, extremely low-income households would have had an income below \$8,985 unadjusted for family size in 2000.

##### **Family Type**

##### **Extremely Low-Income Large Families**

2000 Census data indicates that 0.0% of large related family renters were paying more than 30% but less than 50% of their income for rent and utilities while 7.5% of large related family renters were paying more than 50% of their income for rent and utilities. For large related family owners, 45.5% were paying more than 50% of their income for rent and utilities, while 9.0% were paying more than 30% but less than 50%.

Of the population of all large related renter households, 92.5% of all large related renter households in this income category were living in dwelling units that were overcrowded or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. A dwelling unit is considered to be overcrowded if there is an average of more than one person per room. For large related family owners, 36.4 % were living in dwelling units that were overcrowded or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

##### **Extremely Low-Income Elderly and One and Two Person Households**

Of the three groups of renters identified in the Table I-A (next page), the problem of rent affordability in terms of raw numbers is greatest for the small related (2-4 persons) households who are paying >50% of their monthly income for rent and utilities. 64.1% of all small related renter households (424 households) were rent burdened at the >50% level, while 11.1% of all small related renter households (73 households) were burdened at the >50% level.

*SPECIAL HUD REPORT - TABLE I-A*

*SOCDS CHAS Data: Housing Problems Output for All Households*

Name of Jurisdiction: Harrisonburg city, Virginia			Source of Data: CHAS Data Book			Data Current as of: 2000					
	Renters					Owners					
Household by Type, Income, & Housing Problem	Elderly (1 & 2 members)	Small Related (2 to 4 members)	Large Related (5 or more members)	All Other	Total Renters	Elderly (1 & 2 members)	Small Related (2 to 4 members)	Large Related (5 or more members)	All Other	Total Owners	Total Households
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
1. Household Income <= 50% MFI	502	684	128	2,278	3,592	308	134	95	169	706	4,298
2. Household Income <=30% MFI	309	399	54	1,444	2,206	114	34	55	85	288	2,494
3. % with any housing problems	66.3	78.7	100.0	87.5	83.3	51.8	55.9	81.8	88.2	68.8	81.6
4. % Cost Burden >30%	63.1	76.2	53.7	87.3	81.1	51.8	55.9	63.6	88.2	65.3	79.2
5. % Cost Burden >50%	42.1	64.9	53.7	72.4	66.3	39.5	55.9	63.6	88.2	60.4	65.6
6. Household Income >30 to <=50% MFI	193	285	74	834	1,386	194	100	40	84	418	1,804
7. % with any housing problems	59.1	68.4	100.0	62.2	65.1	35.6	60.0	75.0	82.1	54.5	62.6
8. % Cost Burden >30%	59.1	68.4	45.9	61.8	61.9	35.6	60.0	50.0	82.1	52.2	59.6
9. % Cost Burden >50%	15.0	17.5	0.0	33.0	25.5	10.3	35.0	50.0	65.5	31.1	26.8
10. Household Income >50 to <=80% MFI	200	560	115	790	1,665	299	95	74	115	583	2,248

<b>11.% with any housing problems</b>	17.5	33.0	60.9	33.5	33.3	16.4	36.8	18.9	47.8	26.2	31.5
<b>12.% Cost Burden &gt;30%</b>	17.5	20.5	8.7	33.5	25.5	16.4	36.8	13.5	47.8	25.6	25.5
<b>13. % Cost Burden &gt;50%</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	1.5	1.3	15.8	0.0	21.7	7.5	3.1
<b>14. Household Income &gt;80% MFI</b>	165	910	195	1,445	2,715	930	2,150	280	475	3,835	6,550
<b>15.% with any housing problems</b>	6.1	9.9	35.9	9.0	11.0	7.0	5.3	8.9	8.4	6.4	8.3
<b>16.% Cost Burden &gt;30%</b>	6.1	0.0	5.1	5.9	3.9	7.0	4.7	5.4	8.4	5.7	5.0
<b>17. % Cost Burden &gt;50%</b>	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.6
<b>18. Total Households</b>	867	2,154	438	4,513	7,972	1,537	2,379	449	759	5,124	13,096
<b>19. % with any housing problems</b>	42.0	36.4	61.2	48.3	45.1	15.7	9.6	25.4	31.5	16.1	33.7
<b>20. % Cost Burden &gt;30</b>	40.8	28.5	18.9	47.1	39.8	15.7	9.0	17.8	31.5	15.1	30.2
<b>21. % Cost Burden &gt;50</b>	19.5	14.3	6.6	29.8	23.2	5.1	3.7	12.2	20.4	7.4	17.0

**Definitions:**

**Any housing problems:** cost burden greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

**Other housing problems:** overcrowding (1.01 or more persons per room) and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

**Elderly households:** 1 or 2 person household, either person 62 years old or older.

**Renter:** Data do not include renters living on boats, RVs, or vans. This excludes approximately 25,000 households nationwide.

**Cost Burden:** Cost burden is the fraction of a household's total gross income spent on housing costs. For renters, housing costs include rent paid by the tenant plus utilities. For owners, housing costs include mortgage payment, taxes, insurance, and utilities.

## Tenure

### Extremely Low-Income Renters

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities. Households who are severely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities.

According to the 2000 Census, 323 households in Harrisonburg with incomes of 0-30% of median income were cost burdened. This constitutes 14.7% of all renter households in this extremely low-income category. According to the 2000 Census, 1,410 households with incomes of 0-30% of median income were severely cost burdened. This constitutes 64.2% of all renter households in this income category. See Table I-B.

Table I-B Renters Cost Burdened and Extremely Cost Burdened With Incomes 0-30% of Median	
	Percent
Cost Burdened	14.7%
Extremely Cost Burdened	64.2%

Renters in this income category are income qualified to receive rent assistance through the Housing Authority to help pay the rent on privately owned units and to rent subsidized units owned by the Housing Authority. In addition, they are qualified to rent privately owned units that were constructed using federal housing program funding. For this reason, the following information on the Housing Authority waiting list is included here. The City has no information on the waiting lists for privately owned subsidized rental units in Harrisonburg. The following table provides information on the Housing Authority waiting list for January 2003 through December 2003.

**Table I-C**  
**WAITING LIST FOR HARRISONBURG FAMILY PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS**  
 FOR ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS from January 2003 through December 2003

<b>Month/Year</b>	<b>Number of Applications</b>
January 2003	110
February 2003	105
March 2003	99
April 2003	54
May 2003	47
June 2003	62
July 2003	62
August 2003	61
September 2003	59
October 2003	59
November 2003	30
December 2003	28

Fiscal Year Average 64.6

Source: Harrisonburg Housing Authority

**Table I-D**  
**Housing Authority Waiting List as of December 31, 2003**

<b>Number of Bedrooms</b>	<b># on waiting list</b>
1	9
2	11
3	8
4+	0
Total: 28	

Source: Harrisonburg Housing Authority

Based on 2000 Census data and Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority information, there are the following housing needs for extremely low-income renters:

- Additional code compliant, affordable rental units; new construction; or rehabilitated existing units;
- Additional section 8 rental assistance;
- Improved public transportation that links residences with employment;
- Tenant training;
- Financial management training/ credit counseling;
- Affordable and safe childcare; and
- Education and job training.

It is important to address these issues to assist extremely low-income renter households improve living situations, increase their level of income through education, and provide a safe environment for children.

#### Extremely Low-Income Owner

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Households who are extremely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Selected monthly owner costs are the sum of payments for mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase, or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; utilities; and fuels. It also includes, where appropriate, monthly condominium fees or mobile home costs.

2000 Census data indicates that 172 owner households with incomes in the 0-30% of median range were cost burdened. 2000 Census also indicates that of the 172 households, 162 were extremely cost burdened.

At this income level, a higher percentage of renters are housing cost burdened at the 30+% of income level as well as at the 50+% level than owners in the same categories.

The highest incidence (percentage) and largest actual raw number of owners who are cost burdened and severely cost burdened occurs in this extremely low-income level.

While Table I-A shows that a higher percentage of elderly renters are cost burdened at the 30+% of income level than are elderly owners in the same income level, it appears that in general, owners in this income level have about the same incidence of housing cost burden as renters. However, this cost burden does not address the issue of maintenance costs, which owners must cover and renters do not. This is particularly important at this income level as the homes affordable to households in this income level are older and have greater maintenance costs.

Based on discussion elsewhere in this Plan of the age and condition of housing stock, and the information contained in Table II-A, the City concludes that extremely low-income home owners may have the following needs:

- Housing rehabilitation assistance, including energy related improvements;
- Affordable housing maintenance services to assist older adults with routine house maintenance and minor repair work;

- Access to training and information regarding home repair and maintenance to reduce maintenance costs and improve the long-term quality of the improvements owners make themselves;
- Affordable and safe childcare; and
- Improved public transportation that links residences with employment.

In addition to addressing this issue on the supply side, it is important to provide these extremely low income households with the assistance they need to better manage their limited resources and to increase their level of income through education, financial management training, job training, and affordable child care.

### **Very Low-Income Households**

Very low-income households are those with an annual income between 30% and 50% of median income for the City. Based on the 2000 Census median household income of \$29,949, this level corresponds to a 2000 income between \$8,985 and \$14,975, unadjusted for family size.

### **Family Type**

#### **Very Low-Income Large Households**

According to the 2000 Census data, the incidence of overcrowding or lack of complete kitchen or plumbing facilities in large related renter family households in this income category is 71.6% while the incidence of overcrowding among owner households in this income category is 50%.

#### **Very Low-Income Elderly and One and Two Person Households**

According to the 2000 Census, elderly and small renter households in this income category had the highest incidence of having any housing problems (67.1%) as compared to elderly and small renter households of all other income categories.

### **Tenure**

#### **Very Low-Income Renters**

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities. Households who are severely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities.

According to the 2000 Census, 323 or 14.7% of all renter households in this income category were cost burdened. A total of 1,410 households or 64.2% are severely cost burdened.

Renters in this income category are income-qualified to receive rent assistance through the Housing Authority to help pay the rent on privately owned units and to rent subsidized units owned by the Housing Authority. In addition, they are qualified to rent privately owned units that were constructed under federal housing program funding.

Based on the information in the Housing Market Analysis, the Housing Authority waiting list, and the information in the Table I-A, the City concludes that very low-income renters generally have the same types of needs as previously described for the population of extremely low-income renters.

#### Very Low-Income Owners

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Households who are extremely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Selected monthly owner costs is the sum of payments for mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase, or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; utilities; and fuels. It also includes, where appropriate, the monthly condominium fees or mobile home costs.

According to the 2000 Census, 10 or 3.4% of all households in the City of Harrisonburg in the very low-income owners category were cost burdened. The Census also indicated that 162 or 54.9% were extremely cost burdened.

Table I-A shows that more elderly renters are cost burdened at the 30%+ of income level than are elderly owners in the same income level, and in general, renters in this income level have a slightly higher incidence of housing cost burden than owners. However, this cost burden does not address the issue of maintenance costs, which owners must cover and renters do not. This is particularly important at this income level as the homes affordable to households in this income level are older and have greater maintenance costs.

At the higher income level of this population, there is a significant drop in the percentage of owners who are housing cost burdened.

Based on the discussion of the age and condition of housing stock, and on the information contained in Table I-A, the City concludes that very low-income homeowners have the same needs as those previously described for extremely low-income owners.

In terms of non-housing service needs, these would also be the same as for extremely low-income households: assistance to learn to better manage limited financial resources, assistance to increase earning capacity through education and job training, and affordable childcare.



### **Low-Income Households**

Low-income households are those with an income between 51% and 80% of the median income for the City. (NOTE: This income segment is referred to as "other low-income" in Table I-A). Based on the 2000 Census median household income of \$29,949, low-income households would be those with incomes between \$15,274 and \$23,959, unadjusted for family size.

### **Family Type**

#### **Low-Income Large Families**

According to the 2000 Census data, large renter families in this income category do not have significant incidence of housing cost burden, but 49.5% do experience overcrowding or lack complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

#### **Elderly and One and Two Person Households**

According to the 2000 Census, 34 or 17.3% of one and two person renter households in this income category are cost burdened. No renters in this category were severely cost burdened.

### **Tenure**

#### **Low-Income Renters**

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities. Households who are severely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities.

According to the 2000 Census data, 404 or 24.3% of all renter households in this income category were cost burdened. The most significant portion of the cost burdened population was elderly and one and two member households, 38.5% of whom are cost burdened. The 2000 Census data indicated that 23 or 1.4% of all renter households in this income category were severely cost burdened.

It should be noted that renters at this income level do not income-qualify for rent assistance or subsidized housing. Based on this information, the City concludes that low-income renters have the following needs:

- Additional rental units affordable to this population. These units should be primarily one and two bedroom units to meet the largest portion of this population in need, the elderly and one and two person households; and
- Tenant training.

In addition to addressing this issue on the supply side, it is important to provide low-income households with the assistance they need to better manage their limited resources and to increase their level of income through education, job training, financial management training, transportation assistance, and affordable child care.

Due to the fact that the elderly portion of this population is generally living on a fixed income and has no additional income-earning potential, the education and job training assistance would obviously not be directed toward them. Based on raw numbers, it also appears that the production of additional affordable units should probably be equally directed toward the elderly and the younger population.

### Low-Income Owners

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Households who are severely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Selected monthly owner costs is the sum of payments for mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase, or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; utilities; and fuels. It also includes, where appropriate, the monthly condominium fees or mobile home costs.

According to the 2000 Census, 98 owner households in the City in this income category were cost burdened. This accounts for 17.4% of all owner households in this income category. The 2000 Census also indicated that 43 or 7.6% of all owner households in this income category were severely cost burdened.

Based on this information, the City concludes that low-income owners have the following needs:

- Housing rehabilitation assistance, including energy related improvements;
- Access to training and information regarding home repair and maintenance to reduce maintenance costs and improve the long-term quality of the improvement owners make themselves;
- Transportation assistance;
- Affordable health care.

In addition to addressing this issue on the supply side, it is important to provide these other low-income households with the assistance they need to better manage their limited resources and to increase their level of income through education, job training, financial management training, and affordable child care. For older adults and disabled persons, maintenance assistance is needed.

### Moderate-Income Households

Moderate-income households are those with an income of 81-99% of median income. Based on a 2000 Census median household income of \$29,949, this would mean a 2000 income between \$24,259 and \$29,650, unadjusted for family size. Table I-A classifies moderate-income households as those with incomes of 81-95% of median.

## **Family Type**

### Large Families

According to the 2000 Census, only 10 renter households or 5% in this income category were cost burdened, and none were severely cost burdened.

### Elderly and One and Two Person Households

2000 Census data provides information on elderly households and small households, which are one and two person households. The 2000 Census indicated that 10 or 6.1% of elderly renter households in this income category have any housing problem, but none are cost burdened or severely cost burdened. Of the small renter households in this income category, 95 or 10.4% had any housing problem, and none were cost burdened or severely cost burdened.

## **Tenure**

### Moderate-Income Renters

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities. Households who are severely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for gross rent, which includes utilities.

According to the 2000 Census, 95 or 3.5% of all renters in this income category were cost burdened. The Census also indicated that there were no renters in this income category that were severely cost burdened. As there does not appear to be a cost problem for renters in this income category, the City has no plans to give primary attention to the housing issues of renters in this level.

### Moderate-Income Owners

Households who are cost burdened are paying more than 30% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Households who are extremely cost burdened are paying more than 50% of gross income for selected monthly owner costs. Selected monthly owner costs is the sum of payments for mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase, or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; utilities; and fuels. It also includes, where appropriate, the monthly condominium fees or mobile home costs.

According to the 2000 Census, 192 or 5% of all owners in this income category were cost burdened. The 2000 Census also indicated that only 31 households or 0.8% in this income category were severely cost burdened.

As there doesn't appear to be a significant problem for owners in this income category, the City has no plans to make housing-related assistance a priority for these owners.

## 2. Housing (Market Analysis/supply):

### General Characteristics

This analysis is broken into three sections. The first section addresses the housing market and inventory in general; the second section addresses renter occupied housing; and the third section addresses owner occupied housing.

### GENERAL HOUSING MARKET DATA

According to the 2000 census, there were a total of 13,689 housing units in Harrisonburg. Of these, 13,133 were occupied and 556 were vacant. Of the occupied units, 5,125 were owner occupied and 8,008 were renter occupied.

During the 1990's, the proportion of renter occupied units increased as compared to the number of owner occupied units. Census data indicates that in 2000, 61% of all occupied units were occupied by renters, compared to 1990, when 57.9% of all occupied units were occupied by renters. (See Table II-A)

**Table II-A**  
**Comparison of 1990 and 2000 General Housing Data**

	1990 Census	2000 Census
Percent of occupied units occupied by renters	57.9%	61%
Percent of occupied units occupied by owners	42.1%	39%
Total number of housing units	10,900	13,689
Vacancy Rates	5.7%	4.06%
Source: 1990 and 2000 Census		

There were 2,789 additional housing units in 2000 as compared with 1990. Of these additional units, 2,041 were rental units and 748 were owner occupied. The overall vacancy rate decreased by 1.64% from 1990 to 2000 (5.7% and 4.06% respectively). (See Table II-A)

**Table II-B  
CITY OF HARRISONBURG  
NEW DWELLING CONSTRUCTION  
1990 to 1999**

Year	Single Family Units	Townhouses Units	Multifamily Units
1990	39	78	226
1991	40	24	36
1992	51	18	70
1993	60	58	20
1994	68	68	0
1995	56	66	37
1996	62	56	278
1997	92	87	411
1998	69	108	113
1999	63	121	396
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>1587</b>

Source: City of Harrisonburg Department of Community Development

**Note – The difference between the total new dwelling construction (2,871) and the number of additional housing units (2,789) is attributed to the demolition of 82 existing units.**

#### Summary of Population Growth and Housing Production

1990 POPULATION .....	30,707 (U.S. CENSUS)
2000 POPULATION .....	40,468 (U. S. CENSUS)
POPULATION GROWTH 1990-2000 .....	9,761
TOTAL DWELLING UNITS PER 1990 CENSUS.....	10,900
TOTAL ADDITIONAL UNITS 1990-2000.....	2,789
TOTAL UNITS PER 2000 CENSUS.....	13,689

#### POPULATION

The 1990 census indicated that the City had a total population of 30,707. The 2000 Census lists the City's population at 40,468. This increase of 9,761 persons constitutes a 31.8% population increase from 1990 through 2000. This growth rate exceeds the 14.4% rate experienced by the Commonwealth of Virginia as a whole during the same time period, as well as the 17.8% growth of surrounding Rockingham County. There was an increase of 326 in the institutional population and an increase of 797 in the number of University students living in college dormitories.

Subtracting the 326 additional institutionalized persons and the 797 additional dormitory students from the total 1990-1999 growth of 9,761 leaves 8,638 additional persons requiring housing. Applying the 2000 Census figure of an average of 2.53 persons per occupied housing unit to that number would calculate the need for 3,414 additional dwelling units. See Table II-B.

According to the City building permits records, an additional 2,789 dwelling units were constructed from 1990 to 2000. Of these, 73% appear to be rental units. During the same 1990 – 2000 period, 82 total units were demolished.

#### INCOME AND HOUSING COSTS

According to the 2000 Census, the 1999 median household income for the City of Harrisonburg was \$29,949, which translates into a monthly income of \$2,496.

The 1990 City median gross rent of \$410 was 17% of the monthly median income in 1990. The 2000 City median gross rent of \$480 was 19.2% of median income in 2000. The 1990 Census indicated that 46.6% of all renters were paying 24.9% or less of their gross monthly income for selected housing costs, and in 2000, 46.7% of all renters paid 0-24.9% of their 1999 income for selected housing costs. This makes rental property in Harrisonburg fairly affordable and stable over this time period.

Approximately 16.5% of all owners were paying 30% or more of their monthly income for selected housing costs per the 2000 census, up from 14.6% in the 1990 Census. This could indicate a housing affordability issue for lower income renters. Selected monthly owner costs is the sum of payments for mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase, or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; utilities; and fuels. It also includes, where appropriate, the monthly condominium fees or mobile home costs.

**Table II-C**  
**Monthly Owner Costs and Monthly Income**

	1990 Census	2000 Census
% of Monthly Income spent on Selected Monthly Owner Costs for Mortgaged Home	34.4%	36.7%
% of Households that pay 0-24.9% of Monthly Gross Income for Selected Monthly Owner Costs	76.1%	78.1%
Ratio of Median Home Values to Median Income	3.52	4.10
Source: 1990, 2000 Census		

The median selected monthly owner cost for a mortgaged home per the 2000 Census was \$916 – or 36.7% of the median monthly gross income. The median owner cost on homes with mortgages was 34.4% of median income in 1990. In 1990, the Census indicated that 76.1% of all owner occupied households were paying 24% or less of their monthly gross income for selected housing costs, while the 2000 Census indicated that 78.1% of all owner occupied households had selected monthly owner costs of 24% or less of monthly gross income. It is also interesting to note that the median 2000 home value of \$122,700 was 4.10 times larger than the annual median household income, while the 1990 home value was 3.52 times the annual median income. These figures indicate a decrease in housing affordability in the non-cost burdened owner population. See Table II-C.

Table II-D comparing 1990 and 2000 median income with various housing cost factors shows that there was an increase in housing costs during the 1990's. There was also an increase in median income, although not in proportion to the increase in housing costs. However, neither mortgages nor rents increased in proportion to the increased housing costs.

**Table II-D**  
**1990 – 2000 COMPARISON OF SELECTED HOUSING COST FACTORS**

	1990	2000
Median Household Income	\$ 25,312	\$ 29,949
Median Home Value	\$ 89,300	\$122,700
Median Owner Cost (House with mortgage)	\$ 726	\$ 916
Median Gross Rent	\$ 410	\$ 480

Source: 1990, 2000 census

All this seems to point to a changing relationship between wages and housing costs in the City of Harrisonburg from 1990 to 2000, with an increase in affordability for owner occupied households, as well as an increase in affordability for renter households.

Based on the 2000 Census information, it appears that overall, rental owner occupied housing in Harrisonburg is affordable to a median income family, but owner occupied housing is becoming less affordable. The 1999 median city income is \$29,949 per year for a household. That would be a monthly income of \$2,495.75 and 30% of that amount would equal \$748.73.

When figuring an interest rate of 7.00% with a 30-year mortgage a person of median income could afford a home costing \$112,495. As noted above, the median home value in Harrisonburg was \$122,700 in 2000. Using data from the Harrisonburg Commissioner of the Revenue's Office, it was determined that the median sale price for a single family home in Harrisonburg in 2003 was \$136,000. Both of these figures support a conclusion of decreasing affordability for owner occupied housing in Harrisonburg. See Tables II-X and II-Y for further data.

## **HOUSING TENURE**

The following tables provide information on tenure and occupancy.

**Table II-E  
TENURE BY CENSUS TRACT**

TRACT	POP.	2000 UNITS	ALL OCCUPIED UNITS	OWNER OCCUPIED	RENTER OCCUPIED
1	7,073	2,832	2,739	1,259 46.0%	1,480 54.0%
2.01	5,599	2,329	2,205	948 43.0%	1,257 57.0%
2.02	5,238	1,633	1,604	154 9.6%	1,450 90.4%
2.03	1,201	599	512	327 63.9%	185 36.1%
3	7,396	3,033	2,933	1,208 41.2%	1,725 58.8%
4	6,767	<u>3,263</u>	<u>3,140</u>	<u>1,229</u> 39.0%	<u>1,911</u> 61.0%
Totals		13,689	13,133	5,125 39.0%	8,008 61%

PERCENTAGE OF OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS CITYWIDE: 39%

PERCENTAGE OF RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS CITYWIDE: 61%

Source: 2000 Census

**Table II-F  
TENURE BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS PER DWELLING UNIT**

		OCCUPIED	
	UNITS	OWNER	RENTER
0 bedroom	230	25	205
1 bedroom	1,973	79	1,894
2 bedrooms	3,568	701	2,867
3 bedrooms	4,101	2,704	1,397
4 bedrooms	2,804	1,332	1,472
5+ bedrooms	457	291	166
TOTAL	13,133	5,132	8,001

Source: 2000 census

Table II-F shows that there are actually more rental units in the City than owner occupied housing, particularly in the 0 – 2 bedrooms categories. The 3 – 5 bedroom categories show a slightly higher number of owner occupied units than rental units.



This is a potential problem for low-income large families. According to the 2000 Census, there were 902 large related (5 or more people) households in the City. Of the 902 large households, 70 were very low-income or extremely low-income. Of the 13,133 occupied dwelling units, 1,638 or 12.5% are rental units with 4 or more bedrooms. Of those 13,133 households, 682 or 5% are large related households that rent. In 2000 there were adequate rental units for large families, but 89% of those units charged rents in excess of \$300 dollars per month, which may be beyond the means of most low- or extremely low-income families.

**Table II-G  
TENURE BY PERSONS IN UNIT**

	TOTAL UNITS	OWNER OCCUPIED	RENTER OCCUPIED
1 person	3,722	1,188	2,534
2 persons	4,041	1,986	2,055
3 persons	1,955	792	1,163
4 persons	2,284	710	1,574
5 persons	697	285	412
6 persons	236	91	145
7+ persons	198	73	125

Source: 2000 census

Table II-G shows that 7,763 households or 59% of the households in the City were one and two person households per the 2000 Census.

**Table II-H  
PERCENTAGE OF RENTER UNITS BY TRACT**

TRACT	RENTER PERCENTAGE	LMI PERCENTAGE
1	54	47.8
2.01	57	38.4
2.02*	90.4	85.9
2.03	36.2	26.3
3	58.8	47.5
4*	60.9	52.7

\*Low to moderate income census tracts  
Source: 2000 census

Table II-H illustrates the correlation between Census tracts with a higher proportion of renters and low to moderate-income tracts. In fact, there is a fairly strong correlation between low to moderate-income tracts and larger percentages of rental units.

**Table II-I  
TENURE STATUS OF PRE 1940 UNITS IN LMI CENSUS TRACTS**

2000 LMI TRACT	TOTAL OCCUPIED	PRE-1940 UNITS OWNER	%	PRE-1940 UNITS RENTER	%
1	165	97	58.8	68	41.2
2.01	318	151	47.5	167	52.5
2.02*	21	7	33.3	21	66.7
2.03	40	40	100.0	0	0.0
3	215	109	50.7	106	49.3
4*	<u>344</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>50.3</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>49.7</u>
TOTAL	1,103	577	52.3	526	47.7

\*low to moderate income census tracts

Source: 2000 census

Additional analysis of data contained in Table II-I indicates that of the total 1,103 pre-1940 renter occupied units in the City, 372 or 33% are located in LMI census tracts, but overall, more pre-1940 units are owner-occupied than renter-occupied.

### CONDITION OF HOUSING STOCK

2000 Census data indicates that only 8.6% of all housing units in Harrisonburg were built prior to 1940.

Older housing units generally offer an advantage in that they tend to be more affordable and some may be of such a construction and condition that would merit historic structure recognition. However, these units also require more maintenance than a new home, and may have other problems that are expensive to correct.

**Table II-J  
AGE COMPOSITION OF HOUSING STOCK**

	Total Units	% of all Housing	Total Occupied Units	Owner Occupied Units	Renter Occupied Units
Built 1999 to March 2000	292	2.1	226	93	133
Built 1995 to 1998	1602	11.7	1,517	435	1,082
Built 1990 to 1994	1384	10.1	1,342	532	810
Built 1980 to 1989	2675	19.5	2,591	724	1,867
Built 1970 to 1979	2985	21.8	2,881	957	1,924
Built 1960 to 1969	1466	10.7	1,447	700	747
Built 1950 to 1959	1390	10.2	1,360	730	630
Built 1940 to 1949	719	5.3	666	384	282
Built 1939 or earlier	1176	8.6	1,103	577	526
Total:	13,689	100	13,133	5,132	8,001
Source: 2000 Census					

As previously discussed the 2000 Census indicated that 61% of all occupied housing units were renter-occupied. In 2000, data in Table II-J shows that renters did not occupy a disproportionate number of pre- 1940 dwelling units. Renters occupied approximately 48% of the pre-1940 units. There does not appear to be a correlation between age of dwelling units and the proportion of renters occupying those units.

There is also little correlation between the age of dwelling units and low to moderate-income census tracts. As the Table II-I shows, 372 pre-1940 units are located in LMI census tracts out of a total of 1,103 pre-1940 units city-wide. Those 372 units represent only 4.5% of the total units in the LMI census tracts.

Also see the HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION ON TENURE section which addresses value versus age of housing stock. Low to Moderate-income areas typically have older housing and are in need of neighborhood revitalization to capitalize on affordable housing and access to jobs. To make this happen, housing purchase assistance, lead abatement, and historic preservation tax credits may need to be available to owners and investors.

#### **Substandard Units**

The City will utilize the following definitions for the purpose of this Plan:

Substandard housing unit: 1) a residential property having one or more structural, electrical, plumbing, or heating code violations that pose a risk to health and safety; 2) a residential property which has no code violation posing a threat to health and safety but whose exterior appearance constitutes blighting influence on the neighborhood.

Substandard housing unit suitable for rehabilitation: a residential property where the substandard conditions as defined above can be corrected at a cost that does not exceed 75% of the post rehabilitation value of the property.

Substandard housing unit not suitable for rehabilitation: a substandard property in such a condition that the cost of correcting the substandard conditions will exceed 75% of the post rehabilitation value of the property.

The City does not have comprehensive, inspection-based data on the structural condition of our housing stock at this time.

**Housing suitable for occupancy by elderly families, disabled families (including need for modifications), and families with children.**

In determining the suitability of housing for occupancy by elderly and disabled families, the City would need to have data on the number of currently accessible units, those which could be made accessible, as well as the accessibility needs of the elderly and disabled populations. The realistic tenancy status of these families, the cost of accessible and potentially accessible housing, and the number of elderly and disabled families needing accessible housing would also need to be known. The City has none of this data and therefore cannot draw any reasonable conclusions.

**Student Housing**

The James Madison University student population has had a significant impact on the housing stock, especially in census tract 2.01, which is a primary student housing area. There is no data from the 1990 Census from tract 2.01 alone as tracts 2.01, 2.02 and 2.03 were listed as a single tract, tract 2, in the 1990 Census. However, the population of tract 2 in 1990 was 11,829, as compared to a combined total of 17,946 for tracts 2.01, 2.02 and 2.03 in 2000, an increase of 51.7 %. This growth in raw numbers was the largest growth seen in any tract in the City during that time period. The presence of student renters in Tracts 2.01, 2.02 and 2.03 reduces the number of rental units that would be available for families and also drives rents up, but it should be noted that most of the rental units built in these areas were constructed specifically to attract students. The median rent in tract 2 was \$443 per the 1990 Census, while the median rent for the city was \$410. In 2000, the median rents in tracts 2.01 (predominantly student housing), 2.02, and 2.03 were \$526, \$426, and \$588 respectively. Additionally, the conversion of single family homes to duplexes in the University area is causing a density problem in Census tract 2.02, which was originally a single-family housing area. Signs of this density problem include on and off street parking problems.

**AREAS OF CONCENTRATION OF LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS**

For the purpose of this plan, the City of Harrisonburg defines areas of concentration of low-income households to be low to moderate-income (LMI) census tracts and those low to moderate-income block groups that are in non-LMI census tracts. These areas of concentrated low-income households are shown on **Map 1**.

## HOUSING STOCK INFORMATION BY TENURE

### RENTER DATA

#### Affordability

Table II-K indicates that in 1990, there were 2,352 renter households with an income below \$19,999 paying 35% or more for their monthly income for gross rent. These rent burdened households made up 29.4% of all the rental units in the City. Table II-K also shows that a significant proportion (73.2%) of those renters in the \$20,000 to \$34,999 income range are paying less than 30% of their income for rent.

**Table II-K**  
**HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999 BY GROSS RENT**  
**AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999**

INCOME	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
	<u>0-19%</u>	<u>20-24%</u>	<u>25-29%</u>	<u>30-34%</u>	<u>35%+</u>
<\$10,000	45	61	115	37	1,319
\$10,000-19,999	134	191	212	255	1,033
\$20,000-34,999	723	522	299	278	288
\$35,000-49,999	921	152	40	63	59
\$50,000+	950	30	17	0	0

Source: 2000 Census

Per 2000 Census, Table II-L shows that 31.3% of the renter households with a head of household of 15-64 years of age were rent burdened (paying 35% or more of their monthly income for gross rent), while only 3.5% of the renter households 65 years old and older are rent burdened. This is especially significant in that the raw number of the younger category of renter householder is much larger than the older category.

**Table II-L**  
**AGE OF HOUSEHOLD BY GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF INCOME IN 1999**

% OF INCOME	AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER	
	<u>15-64</u>	<u>65+</u>
<20%	2,603	170
20-24%	880	76
25-29%	568	115
30-34%	542	91
35+%	2,430	269

Source: 2000 Census

Table II-N shows that the majority of units, regardless of the number of bedrooms, fall into the \$300-749 per month category. There are slightly more three bedroom units than two bedroom units overall in the City.

There has been an increase in fair market rents as shown in Table II-M. The increases were approximately 6.5% across the board, regardless of number of bedrooms in the unit.

**Table II-M  
HISTORICAL DATA ON FAIR MARKET RENTS**

BEDROOM SIZE	2001	2004	% INCREASE
ZERO	\$289/MONTH	\$308/MONTH	6.5%
ONE	\$401/MONTH	\$427/MONTH	6.5%
TWO	\$507/MONTH	\$540/MONTH	6.5%
THREE	\$695/MONTH	\$740/MONTH	6.5%
FOUR	\$815/MONTH	\$868/MONTH	6.5%

**Table II-N  
BEDROOMS BY GROSS RENT**

CASH RENT	NONE	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS		
		1	2	3+
\$0-199	52	196	137	83
\$200-299	5	129	121	162
\$300-499	129	1,084	1,039	1,047
\$500-749	9	419	1,401	700
\$750-999	0	46	111	435
\$1,000+	10	0	7	512
MEDIAN GROSS RENT - \$480.00				
Source: 2000 Census				

### **Large Family Units/Overcrowding**

Table II-O illustrates the comparison between rental units having 4 or more bedrooms and owner occupied units having the same number of bedrooms. It would thus appear that larger, lower income renter households may be more likely to have problems

securing a rental unit that is both affordable and large enough. As of December 31, 2003, there were 8 households on the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority waiting list for all programs that need three or more bedrooms, showing there is some need for subsidized large rental units.

**Table II-O**  
**BEDROOMS PER UNITS FOR OWNER AND RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS**

# OF BEDROOMS	TOTAL	OWNER	RENTER
NO BEDROOMS	230	25	205
1 BEDROOM	1,973	79	1,894
2 BEDROOMS	3,568	701	2,867
3 BEDROOMS	4,101	2,704	1,397
4 BEDROOMS	2,804	1,332	1,472
5+ BEDROOMS	457	291	166

Source: 2000 Census

The number of persons per renter occupied unit increased from 2.33 in 1990 to 2.54 in 2000, which could indicate that more families were renting, but could also reflect additional college students who are renting off-campus housing. The number of larger rental units appears to be sufficient in quantity. The 2000 Census data indicates that there were 125 renter households with seven or more persons and 145 renter households with six persons while the number of rental units with three or more bedrooms totaled 3,035. The problem may be more of affordability of the larger rental units.

According to the 2000 Census, the population segment with greatest number of persons per dwelling unit were of Hispanic origin with 4.00 persons per dwelling unit.

Other supplementary information provided by HUD for this strategy documented the incidence of overcrowding or other housing problems in rental units by the income of the household. Overall, 2.51 persons per unit was the median number of persons living in rental units in the City per the 2000 Census.

The incidence of overcrowding or other housing problems in all rental units in the City was 6.6%. The incidence of overcrowding for renters with incomes below 80% median was comparable (6%) to the incidence of overcrowding for all rental units. However, the incidence of overcrowding or other housing problems for large rental families was 50% overall; 11.4% for those with incomes of 0-30% of median; 11.4% for those with incomes of 31-50% of median, and 12.6% for those with incomes of 51-80% of median. Clearly, there are some problems for low-income large families who rent. However, this was not an indication of the number of families who fall into this category, but an indication that of the number of large families who are now low-income, a number were living in overcrowded conditions.

**OWNER DATA****Affordability:**

**Table II-P  
VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS**

---

VALUE	UNITS	%
\$0-19,999	28	0.61
\$20,000-29,999	0	0.00
\$30,000-39,999	16	0.35
\$40,000-59,999	93	2.02
\$60,000-79,999	420	9.12
\$80,000-99,999	1,048	22.77
\$100,000 -149,999	1,586	34.46
\$150,000-199,999	768	16.68
\$200,000 or more	644	13.99

**MEDIAN VALUE -\$122,700**

Source: 2000 census

---

**Table II-Q  
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS  
FOR HOUSES WITH A MORTGAGE**

---

MONTHLY COST	UNITS
Less than \$300	17
\$300-499	213
\$500-699	483
\$700-999	1,059
\$1,000- 1,499	884
\$1,500-1,999	316
\$2,000 or more	89

**MEDIAN OWNER COSTS FOR MORTGAGED HOMES - \$916.00**

Source: 2000 Census

---



**Table II-R**  
**HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999 BY SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS**  
**AS A PERCENT OF 1999 HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

<u>INCOME</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME</u>				
	<u>0-19%</u>	<u>20-24%</u>	<u>25-29%</u>	<u>30-34%</u>	<u>35%+</u>
<\$10,000	33	0	0	7	131
\$10,000-19,999	228	41	15	20	164
\$20,000-34,999	321	67	74	97	156
\$35,000-49,999	467	139	65	36	22
\$50,000- 74,999	829	201	94	57	29
\$75,000 -99,999	373	196	0	0	0
\$100,000+	428	70	0	0	0
TOTAL	2,679	714	248	217	502

Source: 2000 census

Note: the census defines selected monthly owner costs as "the sum of payments for mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase, or similar debts on the property; real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; utilities; and fuels."

Tables II-P through II-R provide an overview of affordability indicators regarding owner occupied homes according to the 2000 Census.

Another approach to determining affordability is to compare median income with median owner-occupied home values. Based on the purchase of a home with the median value of \$122,700, 10% down, and the balance financed at a rate of 7% over 30 years, the monthly mortgage payment would have been \$734.69. Add to that a monthly insurance payment of \$10, taxes of \$64 and estimated utility costs of \$100, the total monthly housing expense would have been \$908.69. The HUD determined 2000 median income of \$29,949 translates into a monthly income of \$2,495.75, 30% of which is \$748.63.

Based on this, in 2000 the estimated cost of owning a median value home in Harrisonburg may be out of the affordable range to a household with a median income. However, the table above which relates household income by selected monthly owner costs indicates that a relatively small percentage of owners in the median range were paying more than 30% of their monthly income for housing and related costs. This could be due to the fact that while owners were well aware of monthly costs, they may have overestimated the value of their property when filling out Census questionnaires. This would have lead to inflation of home values as reported by owners on the census questionnaire, thus distorting affordability. An additional factor to consider is that while the Census data indicates that there were relatively few owners with housing costs over 30% of their monthly income at the time the Census data was gathered, those were households who had already owned their own homes. The City estimates may be more appropriately applied to the situation of a median income household purchasing a median value home in 2000.

Based on this, the City concludes that few existing owners had housing affordability problems at the time the 2000 Census data was gathered. It appears that housing affordability (paying more than 30% of monthly income for housing costs) may have been and could continue to be an increasing problem for median income households who are first time buyers and may be a problem for households with incomes below median.

#### OWNER OCCUPANCY AND VALUE DATA

The tracts in the following table had equal to or less than the citywide average of 39% owner occupancy in 2000 and an average value of owner-occupied dwellings less than the City wide average of \$122,700.

**Table II-S**

CENSUS TRACT	% PRE-1940 HOUSING	% OWNER OCCUPIED 2000	% OWNER OCCUPIED 1990	AVG. \$ VALUE 2000	% INCREASE 1990-2000	\$ INCREASE 1990-2000
4*	50.3%	39.0%	40.3%	99,500	29.6%	\$22,700
CITYWIDE	40%	39%	42.1%	\$122,700	37.4%	\$33,400

\*Low to moderate-income census tracts per HUD based on 2000 census  
Source: 1990 and 2000 Census data

The data on the previous table indicates a slight relationship between property values and decrease in owner occupancy. The noted tract did not see property value increases at the same rate as the other census tracts or the city-wide average. This area could be targeted by the city for some neighborhood revitalization efforts, including targeting these areas for proposed home-buyer programs.

The tract in Table II-T had a greater than 39% owner occupancy in 2000 but experienced a drop in the percentage of owner occupancy from 1990 to 2000 and had an average selected single family home value less than the City-wide 2000 average of \$122,700. Further, this tract has the second highest percentage of pre-1940 housing among all of the City's census tracts.

**Table II-T**

CENSUS TRACT	% PRE-1940 HOUSING	% OWNER OCCUPIED 2000	% OWNER OCCUPIED 1990	AVG. \$ VALUE 2000	% INCREASE 1990-2000	\$ INCREASE 1990-2000
1	58.8%	45.9%	46.4%	\$ 90,700	14.4%	\$11,400
CITYWIDE	40%	39%	42.1%	\$122,700	37.4%	\$33,400

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census data

The tract on Table II-T above would form the second tier of tracts in establishing priorities for targeting neighborhood improvement programs.

The census tract in Table II-U has greater than 31% owner occupancy, but experienced a slight drop in the percentage of owner occupancy between 1990 and 2000 but had an average selected single family home value greater than \$122,700. This tract would also be part of the second tier in establishing priorities for targeting neighborhood improvement programs.

**Table II-U**

CENSUS TRACT	% PRE-1940 HOUSING	% OWNER OCCUPIED 2000	% OWNER OCCUPIED 1990	AVG. \$ VALUE 2000	% INCREASE 1990-2000	\$ INCREASE 1990-2000
3	50.7%	41.2%	41.5%	\$138,700	49.8%	\$46,100
CITYWIDE	40%	39%	42.1%	\$122,700	37.4%	\$33,400

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census data

## **PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING**

### **Inventory of Public Housing**

There is one public entity providing subsidized housing in the City of Harrisonburg – the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority (HRHA).

**SUMMARY OF INVENTORY OWNED BY THE HARRISONBURG REDEVELOPMENT  
AND HOUSING AUTHORITY**

	TOTAL (units)	ELDERLY	NON-ELDERLY
Public Housing	160	60	100
Section 8 – New Construction*	62	62	-
Section 8 – Vouchers	410	-	-
New Section 8 – Vouchers	143	-	-
*Owned by Housing Authority			

**PUBLIC HOUSING, ELDERLY**

The Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority currently owns 122 Public Housing units designated for the elderly in Harrisonburg, 62 of which are in a Section 8 new construction project. The elderly Public Housing units are contained in the following two facilities:

J. R. "POLLY" LINEWEAVER APARTMENTS: A five story building with 15 one-bedroom apartments and 47 efficiency apartments.

LINEWEAVER ANNEX: A 60 one-bedroom apartment addition to the Lineweaver apartments

**PUBLIC HOUSING, NON-ELDERLY**

The Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority owns 100 family units in Harrisonburg. These units are in multi-family housing complexes. The inventory breakout by bedroom size is as follows:

**FAMILY UNITS OWNED BY THE HARRISONBURG REDEVELOPMENT  
AND HOUSING AUTHORITY**

NUMBER OF UNITS	NUMBER OF BEDROOMS
18	1
36	2
30	3
12	4
4	5

## **COMPREHENSIVE GRANT PROGRAM**

In 2004, the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority completed a five-year PHA Plan for the purposes of the Comprehensive Grant Program. The Plan and supporting information is included in Appendix C.

All annual action plans for the City of Harrisonburg Consolidated Plan will reference annual revisions in the PHA plan for the Housing Authority's Comprehensive Grant Program.

## **STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF RESIDENTS OF UNITS OWNED BY THE HOUSING AUTHORITY**

A list of the goals and objectives of the Housing Authority, which the Authority is currently making available to tenants, can be found in Appendix C. The Housing Authority plans to continue to address these goals and objectives and is willing to adapt to meet the changing needs of tenants.

- 3. Homeless Individuals (Needs/demand)  
AND**
- 4. Homeless Families (Needs/demand)**

Information for this section was obtained from the agencies listed below in Section B. Data used for this analysis was from 2002 and 2003.

### **A. NATURE AND EXTENT OF HOMELESSNESS**

Based upon interviews with various service agencies, the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Department of Social Services and the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority, long-term homelessness is not an issue in the City of Harrisonburg. There are approximately 8 – 10 known homeless individuals in the City, none visible on the streets.

Several temporary/transitional shelter facilities are located in the City, including those that provide shelter for victims of domestic violence. Among them, they reported 331 families being provided with some form of temporary or transitional housing in 2003. Data is not available on how many of these 331 families were Harrisonburg residents or how many were from outside of the area.

### **B. SHELTERED HOMELESS**

A number of organizations/agencies serve the homeless in Harrisonburg. They are listed below:

#### **Mercy House**

Mercy House is a transitional housing shelter for homeless families with children. The program offers twelve efficiency apartments complete with private kitchens and baths. Assistance with clothing, food, and counseling is available. While at Mercy House, there

must be at least one adult from the family working and saving half of the income for housing. The program's goal is for the residents to achieve self-sufficiency and in many cases end the cycle of homelessness by establishing a cause for their misfortune and a solution. Table III-A indicates demographic information provided by Mercy House.

**Table III-A AGE OF HOMELESS SERVED 7/1/02 - 6/30/03**

1-4 years	54/ 27.3%	18-45 years	71/ 35.9%	Over 60 years	0/0%
5-17 years	63/ 31.8%	46-60 years	10/ 5%		

**Table III-B MINORITY STATUS OF HOMELESS SERVED 7/1/02 - 6/30/03**

Black	49 (24.7%)	Other	15 (7.5%)
Hispanic	30 (15.2%)		

Data is not available on the number of sheltered homeless who are City residents.

### **The Salvation Army**

The Salvation Army provides daily meals and other supportive services to the homeless and low-income families and individuals and operates a shelter for homeless individuals in Harrisonburg. Information on the age and minority status of those served or whether or not they were from the Harrisonburg area was not available.

### **First Step**

First Step provides emergency services including temporary shelter, individual, couples and support group counseling, employment and housing counseling, and children's programs. It also provides follow up case management, court advocacy for its clients, and a Hispanic Outreach program. Services are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

## **C. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING SHELTERED POPULATIONS**

Based on the information gathered by the City, the City estimates that during any given week, there are probably less than 24 homeless persons in shelter in the City. Of these, the City estimates that 25% are victims of domestic violence housed at the domestic abuse shelter, and the balance are homeless for other reasons.

Due to the lack of hard data from all of the shelter providers, it is difficult to reach a conclusion on the number of additional beds needed to continue to meet the needs of those homeless who seek shelter.

Other conclusions regarding the homeless population that can be drawn from data provided by the service agencies, the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Department of Social Services and the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority, are:

- additional job, financial management training and other supportive services are needed for those in transition
- improved security measures are needed for the protection of clients in the transitional shelters.

#### **D. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING UNSHELTERED POPULATIONS**

Based on the limited information available to the City regarding the unsheltered homeless, it could be concluded that there is not a significant problem with unsheltered homeless in Harrisonburg. The City has been made aware of the fact that some homeless may remain unsheltered due to the fact that they are unwilling to comply with shelter behavior requirements (e.g., no alcohol use) or because they have a history of inability to comply with such requirements.

The City has no plans at this time to address the needs of unsheltered homeless.

#### **E. PERSONS THREATENED WITH HOMELESSNESS**

##### **First Step**

This agency provides temporary shelter for individuals and families, couples and support group counseling, employment and housing counseling, and homeless intervention. First Step has had a presence in Harrisonburg since the early 1980's and has 5 full-time and 4 part-time staff. They can house 16 women and children at a time.

##### **Mercy House**

Mercy House is a transitional housing shelter for homeless families with children. The program offers twelve efficiency apartments complete with private kitchens and baths. Assistance with clothing, food, and counseling is available. While at Mercy House, there must be at least one adult from the family working and saving half of the income for housing. The program's goal is for the residents to achieve self-sufficiency and in many cases end the cycle of homelessness by establishing a cause for their misfortune and a solution.

Mercy House has 4 full-time staff and 2 part-time staff. They have 12 separate apartments, each that will house 4 family members, for a total capacity of 48.

The City has no plans to provide direct services to prevent homelessness. However, the City will continue to support the activities of organizations that do.

### **5. Non-homeless (Needs/demand):**

Information for this section was obtained from the agencies noted in each respective subsection. Data used for this analysis was from 2001 through 2004.

## **A. THE ELDERLY**

The Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority currently owns and manages 122 elderly units. Waiting list information is not available for specifically the elderly population.

Per the 2000 Census, the elderly population is generally increasing, with the 75 year and above age group now constituting 53.8% of those persons over age 65 in Harrisonburg. The 80 years and above segment is 32.7% of the over 65 group, while the 85 and over segment is 15.2%. These figures are expected to continue to increase into the next decade.

The Harrisonburg – Rockingham Department of Social Services and other agencies operate a number of programs that assist the elderly.

These programs help clients remain at home or provide supplemental services at community-based residential facilities. Over 64% of people over 65 live in their own homes. Social Services provides funds for home care assistance, allowing elderly persons to remain at home as long as possible. Most who are in need of more intensive care require a nursing home. Along with additional physical facilities, an increase in Federal and State funding will be needed to provide supportive services. In addition to more foster care homes, increased funding for supportive home care, respite, and adult day activities will be needed.

CDBG funds may be used in the provision of eligible services to the elderly. These can include the construction of senior centers and the provision of services and programs. The following have been identified as priority needs of the elderly:

- Improved access to transportation services, especially door to door service;
- Services to the disabled or those in frail health;
- Improved awareness of housing alternatives for seniors; and
- Improved outreach to homebound elderly.

## **B. PERSONS WITH AIDS**

As of April 2004, there were 24 cases of AIDS and an additional 30 HIV cases diagnosed in Harrisonburg. The City is not aware of any special housing needs for HIV/AIDS persons at this time. The area has a number of AIDS information and testing sites and a variety of supportive home health care services and support groups.

## **C. DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED**

Persons with disabilities living with their families utilize various community services including transportation subsidies, counseling and support programs, specialized work activities, and social and recreational opportunities. As parents advance in age, there results a diminishing capacity to care for their disabled adult children. In addition, some developmentally disabled persons may need to move to more independent living arrangements for their own personal advancement. Based on data provided by service agencies, at this time, it appears that support services for the developmentally disabled is the more pressing need.



### **Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC)**

The Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC) provides an array of services for persons with mental retardation and their families. Services include the ARC Op Shop – a work activity center for adults with mental retardation; respite care; parent-to-parent assistance, support, and information (for parents of all types of special needs children); Kids on the Block disability awareness puppet shows; recreation programs; Teenage/Adult Canteen (a twice a month social activity for teens and adults with mental retardation); Dandelion Day Camp (offered several times weekly during the summer); FRIENDS – a companionship program for persons 18 & older with mental retardation; information & referral; monthly informative newsletter; lending library; advocacy; educational meetings/activities; and governmental affairs activities. Clients must have a primary disability of mental retardation.

### **Friendship Industries**

Friendship Industries, Inc. (FI) exists to serve the community by providing employment opportunities and choices for individuals with disabilities. They provide in-house assessment of work abilities and employment training using commercial divisions. They also assist clients in acquiring and maintaining employment in the community. Transportation services are available.

Individuals may be referred by agencies (such as the Virginia Department of Rehabilitative Services, the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Community Services Board, or United Way of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County), by family or friends, or clients may self refer. Services can be funded through third party purchasers.

### **Pleasant View**

Pleasant View provides services and support to adults with developmental disabilities. Pleasant View has two day programs, supported employment, group homes, intermediate care, eldercare, work training, and supervised and independent apartments.

## **D. CRIME**

The City of Harrisonburg feels that crime is an important issue for neighborhood stability.

### **City of Harrisonburg Police Department Reported Offenses**

<b>Classification of Offenses</b>	<b>2001 Cases</b>	<b>2002 Cases</b>
1. Criminal Homicide Total	2	0
a. Murder	1	0
b. Manslaughter by Negligence	1	0
c. Justifiable Homicide	0	0
2. Kidnapping	6	0
3. Major Sex Offenses Total	41	45

a. Forcible Rape	13	21
b. Forcible Sodomy	8	8
c. Sexual Assault with an Object	1	0
d. Forcible Fondling	19	16
4. Robbery Total	31	12
5. Assault Total		
	440	425
a. Aggravated Assaults	61	72
b. Simple Assault	334	321
c. Intimidation	45	32
6. Arson	14	15
7. Extortion/Blackmail	3	0
8. Burglary/Breaking & Entering	179	193
9. Larceny – Theft Total (except motor vehicle)	1165	1050
10. Motor Vehicle Theft Total	91	79
11. Forgery/Counterfeiting	69	46
12. Fraud	102	102
13. Embezzlement	33	22
14. Stolen Property	26	20
15. Vandalism/Property Damage	981	867
16. Drug Related Offenses	266	352
17. Other Sex Offenses Total	29	33
a. Incest	0	0
b. Statutory Rape	1	3
c. Indecent Exposure	28	30
18. Pornography/Obscene Material	0	4
19. Gambling Related Violations	0	0
20. Prostitution	0	1
21. Bribery	0	0
22. Weapon Law Violations	41	84
23. Obscene/Harassing Calls	41	56
24. Using Motor Vehicle w/out Consent	16	19
25. Worthless Checks	5	201
26. Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations	0	0
27. Disorderly Conduct	33	252

28. Driving Under the Influence	26	251
29. Drunkenness	47	608
30. Family Offenses, Non-Violent	35	29
31. Liquor Law Violations	23	472
32. Peeping Tom	28	20
33. Runaway	22	22
34. Trespass on Real Property	72	155
35. Arrest for Other Agency	13	26
36. Contrib. to Delinquency of Minor	14	13
37. Conspiracy to Commit Group A Offense	1	16
38. Consp. to Commit Group B Offense	2	1
39. All Other Offenses	65	434

**Source: Annual Report – Harrisonburg Police Department**

The trend that the Police Department has witnessed over the last few years is a slight decrease in crimes against property and in crimes against persons, accompanied by slight increases in offenses against society and in traffic charges and accidents. The Police Department has several programs that are currently in place and could be expanded in future years or complimented with new programs. Current programs include Community Watch, Auxiliary Police Officers, National Night Out, the Citizens Police Academy, and the Weed and Seed Program.

**Crime Prevention**

Community Watch programs include neighborhood watch, business watch, and fleet watch. All watch programs have been established to provide citizens of the City with a system that can be used to increase safety and security, and which strives to develop a strong cooperative working relationship between the citizens and the police. The Auxiliary Police Officers provide assistance for special events and crime prevention activities, as well as backup for full-time officers. The Crime Prevention section has also implemented the AMBER Alert Program and the D.A.R.E. Program. The Citizens Academy is an opportunity for citizens and other City officials to understand what police officers do. The Weed and Seed Program is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice and locally by the U.S. Attorney's office. The Weed and Seed strategy is to "weed" out drug trafficking, violent crimes, and related offenses through coordinated law enforcement and community policing; and then "seed" the designated areas with prevention, intervention, and treatment programs designed to meet the communities' needs for educational scholarships, training, mentoring programs, and employment opportunities. Weed and Seed links federal, state, and local social services with private sector and community efforts to maximize the impact of existing community programs and resources.

In addition to continued support of the programs noted above, the Police Department has other program needs, such as increased landlord training and increased contact with landlords. The Department needs a database of all rental properties in the City and

landlord contacts, as well as a procedural system to ensure all landlords are notified when a situation arises on their property. This would be particularly helpful in conjunction with a newly adopted “noise ordinance”, which holds landlords to a higher standard of responsibility for their tenants. The Police Department has also indicated that they would like to be involved in City site plan review using Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) theories. This would involve extra staff and training. Other crime prevention priority needs include funding for the following types of programs – programs to reduce juvenile delinquency, community outreach programs, youth intervention programs, anti-drug activities, and gang resistance education.

## **6. Community Development (Needs/demand)**

### **A. Public Facilities**

The acquisition, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or installation of public facilities and improvements are eligible activities under CDBG guidelines. Based on interviews with various City and non-City entities, review of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Recreation Master Plan, Street and Sidewalk Plan, and other studies and reports, the following needs have been identified:

#### **Priority Needs**

- Neighborhood facilities in low to moderate income neighborhoods
- Upgrade park facilities in low to moderate income neighborhoods
- Improve parking availability and infrastructure conditions
- Preservation of Historic Structures
- Improve Child Care facilities in LMI areas

### **B. Infrastructure Improvements**

The construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of public infrastructure improvements are eligible CDBG activities.

#### **Priority Needs**

- Improve streets and traffic control in low to moderate income areas
- Improve sidewalks in low to moderate income areas, particularly those areas nearest schools
- Improve sidewalks and access from apartments and other residential units housing the elderly and disabled to commercial areas and community resources, such as the library

### **C. Economic Development**

CDBG funds may be used to pay for certain economic development activities. These include rehabilitation, infrastructure development, technical assistance, loan and grant programs, micro-enterprise assistance, etc.

**Priority Needs**

Technical Assistance for small businesses  
Assistance to small businesses and industry in the form of low interest loans or grants  
Micro enterprise support  
Elimination of blighting conditions in commercial areas  
Streetscaping/beautification improvements in commercial/industrial areas  
Brownfields redevelopment

**D. Public Service Needs**

CDBG regulations are very broad and allow the use of grant funds to pay for a wide range of public services. Funds may be used to pay for labor, supplies, and materials, as well as to operate and/or maintain the portion of a facility in which the public service is located. This includes the purchase or lease of a facility, equipment, and other property needed for the public service.

**Priority Needs**

Improve facilities that house and/or provide services to the disabled  
Improve programs providing services to the disabled  
Health and medical services for low to moderate income persons  
Temporary housing/transitional housing for the homeless or those threatened with homelessness

**E. Planning and Administration****Priority Needs**

Administration of CDBG Grant Program  
Redevelopment Planning  
Economic Development Planning

**C. Strategies for Addressing Needs****1. Housing****Strategies**

- Target rehabilitation programs to improve LMI housing conditions;
- Target housing projects that remove architectural barriers for the elderly and the physically disabled; and
- Target new housing development that meets housing needs identified by the Housing Authority.

**Specific Objectives**

- Rehabilitate public housing units;
- Financial support for programs that remove architectural barriers for the elderly and disabled;
- Financial support for property improvement grant or loan funds for privately-owned LMI housing; and
- Financial support for the development of single-floor, 1-2 bedroom housing units.

**2. Housing (Market Analysis/supply)****Strategies**

- Target programs that Increase the availability of transitional housing; and
- Target programs that increase the supply of affordable housing for LMI residents.

**Specific Objectives**

- Through the Housing Authority, support organizations that will increase homeownership opportunities for LMI families; and
- Support organizations that provide transitional housing.

**3./4. Homeless Individuals/Families****Strategies**

- Target existing agencies serving the homeless or those threatened with homelessness;
- Target programs that encourage self-sufficiency and self-esteem building; and
- Target programs addressing root causes of homeless-related needs.

**Specific Objectives**

- Provide funding for programs that address job training, financial management and other supportive services needed by those in transition;
- Improve security measures at homeless shelters and transitional housing units for the protection of clients; and
- Support organizations that provide direct services to prevent homelessness.

**5. Non-homeless****A. The Elderly****Strategies**

- Target improved, supportive services including provision of meals and transportation;
- Target programs that improve supportive home care, respite, and adult day activities services;
- Target projects that will remove/minimize architectural barriers for the elderly; and
- Identify potential sources of funding to provide more outreach services.

**Specific Objectives**

- Provide funding for programs that make home/building modifications to accommodate walker and wheelchair use (e.g., wider doorways) and to make upper floors more accessible;
- Support development of single-floor, 1-2 bedroom elderly housing units;
- Provide funding for supportive services for the elderly, i.e. meals, home maintenance, etc; and
- Improve transportation services by providing supplemental funding to agencies that provide specialized transportation.

**B. Persons with AIDS****Strategies**

- Target organizations that serve the needs of those with AIDS or HIV.

**Specific Objectives**

- Provide funding to organizations that serve the needs of persons with AIDS.

**C. Developmentally Disabled****Strategies**

- Target programs promoting independent living, especially job training and placement; and
- Target programs encouraging socialization, including recreational or other day activities.

**Specific Objectives**

- Support agencies that provide job training and employment for the developmentally disabled; and
- Support agencies that will provide expanded day support programs.

**D. Crime Prevention****Strategies**

- Through the police department or other support agencies, involve more neighborhoods in crime awareness and prevention; and
- Through the police department or other agencies, provide more outreach to at-risk youth.

**Specific Objectives**

- Support crime prevention programs and activities such as “Weed & Seed”, and the various community watch groups.

## **6. Community Development**

### **A. Public Facilities**

#### **Strategies**

- Special consideration will be given to public facilities and improvements that:
- Serve a high percentage of low to moderate income persons;
- Eliminate or prevent threats to health and safety;
- Have demonstrated that other funding sources are not available or are inadequate to correct or improve the facility;
- Are located in a blighted or deteriorating area or designated redevelopment area and are directed towards improving the adjacent commercial or residential environment; and
- Are designed to restore and improve the physical condition and appearance of a significant historic structure.

#### **Specific Objectives**

- Provide lighting for recreational facilities in low to moderate income census tracts where none exists;
- Upgrade or add new playground and recreational facilities at existing parks, playgrounds, child care facilities, or recreation centers in low to moderate income census tracts; and
- Eliminate blighting conditions in low to moderate income areas.

### **B. Infrastructure Improvement**

#### **Strategies**

- Target low to moderate income neighborhoods for street, sidewalk, and traffic control improvements;
- Target low to moderate income neighborhoods for water and sewer improvements;
- Target low to moderate income neighborhoods for storm water management and drainage improvements; and
- Target blighted areas for streetscaping and beautification projects.

#### **Specific Objectives**

- Pay for street, sidewalk, and traffic control improvements; water and sewer improvements; and storm water management and drainage improvements in designated LMI areas; and
- Support neighborhood streetscaping and beautification projects.

### **C. Economic Development**

#### **Strategies**

- Target locations for area-wide public improvements;



- Support community based organizations involved with micro-enterprise assistance;
- Continue partnerships with economic development corporations;
- Continue partnerships with small business or micro-enterprise assistance programs; and
- Target projects that encourage the reuse or redevelopment of former manufacturing areas, especially in the central business district.

#### **Specific Objectives**

- Bring at least one new “clean” industry to Harrisonburg;
- Support grants or low interest loans for small “clean” manufacturing firms committed to hiring LMI employees;
- Provide support for a small business loan fund with a variety of funding sources; and
- Identify brownfield properties for potential acquisition and redevelopment.

### **D. Public Service Needs**

#### **Strategies**

Special consideration will be given to public service activities that:

- Require a one-time use of CDBG funds;
- Serve a high percentage of extremely low- and low-income persons;
- Have secured other public or private funds or services for the operation of the program (i.e., volunteers, in kind services, donations, etc.); and
- Request funds for program delivery rather than operating expenses.

#### **Specific Objectives**

- Continue to fund public service activities that target extremely low- and low-income households or individuals.

### **E. Planning and Administration**

#### **Strategies**

- Efficiently administer the block grant program
- Ensure the programs compatibility with the City’s Comprehensive Plan, amendments to the Plan, or other related studies

#### **Specific Objectives**

- Locate other sources of funding and technical assistance for plans and studies that will allow the city to better identify its community development and redevelopment needs.
- Develop targeted redevelopment plans
- Economic Development Programming and Market Analysis
- Historic District Survey

## IV. Annual Action Plan

*Due annually no less than 45 days prior to the grantee's program year start date.*

For Year ☒ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 of Strategic Plan period.

### A. Managing the Process: Citizen Participation

1. Does jurisdiction have a completed and approved Citizen Participation Plan on file? ☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Actions taken to provide for/encourage citizen participation in developing the Strategic Plan or Annual Action Plan. Check all that apply.

Outreach (Indicate methods used):

- ☒ To minorities and non-English-speaking persons
- ☒ To persons with disabilities
- ☐ To low - and moderate-income persons living in slum and blighted areas
- ☒ To low - and moderate-income persons living in areas where CDBG funds are proposed to be used
- ☒ To residents of predominantly low - and moderate-income neighborhoods
- ☒ To residents of public housing

☐ Citizen Advisory Committee

☐ Neighborhood meetings

☐ Focus groups

☒ [Public hearings](#) Dates: May 18 and June 7

☒ Other: (List below)

Public Notices in local newspaper

Press Releases

News Articles

Radio Spots

Fliers in LMI neighborhoods, apartment complexes, local stores and gas stations, library, City Hall, etc.

Announcements on City website and at televised City Council meetings

3. Public Notices/Public Comment:

Was notice given at least two weeks prior? ☒ Yes ☐ No

30-day comment period: From June 8, 2004 to July 7, 2004

Was reasonable access provided to the public for plan review during the 30-day comment period? ☒ Yes ☐ No

## **B. Managing the Process: Consultation with Public and Private Entities**

1. Which organizations were consulted when preparing the Strategic Plan and/or the Annual Action Plan? Check all that apply.

Agencies that provide:

☒ Assisted housing

Indicate names: Pleasant View, Crestwood, Loyaltown, Sunnyside Presbyterian Home, White Birch Estates, Harrisonburg Redevelopment & Housing Authority

☒ Health services

Indicate names: Harrisonburg-Rockingham Health Dept., Harrisonburg-Rockingham Free Clinic

☒ Social services

Indicate names: Harrisonburg-Rockingham Social Services

☒ Homeless services

Indicate names: Mercy House, First Step, Salvation Army

☒ Services to persons with disabilities

Indicate names: Valley Associates for Independent Living

☐ Adjacent units of general local government

Indicate names:

☒ Other (identify): Friends of Blacks Run Greenway, Harrisonburg Downtown Renaissance, Harrisonburg Boys & Girls Club, Roberta Webb Child Care Center, Community Association for Rural Transportation, Harrisonburg Children's Museum, Training to Achieve Rewarding Careers, Harrisonburg-Rockingham Child Care Center, Harrisonburg Economic Development Office, Harrisonburg/JMU Hispanic Council, Valley AIDS Network, Healthy Communities Council, JMU's Institute for Innovation in Health & Human Services

2. Lead agency or entity responsible for overseeing the development of the plan: City Manager's Office

3. Lead Based Paint: What organizations were consulted when preparing the portion of the plan dealing with lead-based paint hazards? (Check all that apply)

☒ State or local health agencies

Indicate names: Harrisonburg-Rockingham Health Department

☒ State or local child welfare agencies

Indicate names: Harrisonburg-Rockingham Social Services

☒ Other

Indicate names: Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority

### C. Managing the Process: Certifications

For each year of the strategic planning period and for applicable programs, [check the certifications](#) on the Certification Checklist that are complete and correct. Until the feature of electronic signatures is available in this Consolidated Planning tool, please submit a hardcopy of each required certification to your local HUD Community Planning and Development Office. Be sure to use the appropriate version ([Local](#) or [State certifications](#)), and that it has been signed by your official Applicant/Grantee Representative (see the "[Applicant Section](#)" in Module I. "Application for Funds From U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development").

Note that by signing these certifications, certain documents must be completed, in use, and on file for verification. These documents include:

1. Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing
2. Citizen Participation Plan
3. Anti-displacement and Relocation Plan

### D. Financial Sources/Uses

Approximately \$648,000 in Federal funds from the CDBG program will be available in FY 2005 to provide decent housing, establish and maintain a suitable living environment, and expand economic opportunities, especially for low- and moderate-income persons.

#### Funding Sources

Entitlement Grant (includes reallocated funds)			
	CDBG	\$648,000	
	ESG	\$0	
	HOME	\$0	
	HOPWA	\$0	
	Total		\$648,000
Prior Years' Program Income NOT previously programmed or reported			
	CDBG	\$0	
	ESG	\$0	
	HOME	\$0	
	HOPWA	\$0	
	Total		\$0

Reprogrammed Prior Years' Funds	
CDBG	\$0
ESG	\$0
HOME	\$0
HOPWA	\$0
Total	\$0
Total Estimated Program Income	\$0
Section 108 Loan Guarantee Fund	\$0
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES	\$648,000
Other Funds	\$0
Submitted Proposed Projects Totals	\$648,000
Un-Submitted Proposed Projects Totals	\$0

The City will not receive program income from prior years (not previously programmed or reported), nor does it anticipate any reprogramming of prior year funds.

The City anticipates that the following Federal, State, local, and private resources will remain or become available over the 3-year planning period to address priority strategies.

### **Federal Resources**

Funds from HUD and any other Federal sources are available to address the Consolidated Plan's priority needs, such as grants and other revenues that may be available to provide funding to the City or other organizations within the City.

**Section 108 Loan Guarantee (Section 108):** Through Section 108, HUD guarantees notes issued by units of general local government. Funds finance economic revitalization and development activities that include housing and rehabilitation of privately owned buildings for residential purposes; expansion of for-profit businesses; financing and rehabilitation of low-income and public housing; acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of neighborhood and community facilities; site improvement on community-owned land leased to a developer for a commercial or industrial development project; site development; purchase of land or buildings for economic development; and infrastructure development that includes street reconstruction and/or sewer system repairs.

**Community Services Block Grant (CSBG):** This program can fund activities to implement anti-poverty activities such as housing counseling, emergency assistance, and other supportive services.

**Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) Grants:** BEDI grants target Economic Development Initiative funds to brownfields projects. BEDI grants are made to local governments for use in supporting brownfield redevelopment activities and projects financed in whole or in part with Section 108 Loan Guarantees.

**Economic Development Initiative (EDI):** The Economic Development Initiative provides grants to be used in tandem with Section 108 guaranteed loans for economic revitalization projects. These grants will enhance the viability of such projects (through interest rate subsidies and debt service/operating reserves) and increase the likelihood that the Section 108 loans can be repaid from project revenue.

**Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives:** Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives are available for buildings listed in the *National Register of Historic Places* or located in certain historic districts that are substantially rehabilitated for income-producing purposes according to standards set by the Secretary of the Interior.

**Home Repair Loan Program (Section 504):** The Home Repair Loan Program is available to low-income and elderly people who prefer to stay in their current homes, though they cannot afford repairs.

**Housing Preservation Grant Program:** This program also makes available funds to repair housing. Non-profits receive grants, and they in turn make funds available to homeowners that cannot afford to make needed repairs.

**Head Start/Early Head Start:** This program awards grants to local public and private nonprofit and for-profit agencies for comprehensive child development services for children and families. Intended primarily for low-income families, the program fosters the development of children and enables them to deal more effectively with both their present environment and later responsibilities in school and community life.

#### **Local Public Resources**

Local funds may also be used to address the Consolidated Plan's priority needs

**City of Harrisonburg General Funds:** These funds support organizations that provide housing and/or supportive services to area residents including low-income families and persons. The City provides approximately \$2,947,784 annually to local outside agencies and organizations from general fund resources.

#### **Subrecipient Voluntary Match**

Although not required by the City in order for an agency or organization to receive CDBG funds, the City of Harrisonburg strongly encourages its subrecipient applicants to show a match (whether agency funds, private donations, or in-kind) against CDBG funds. By demonstrating matching funds, the applicant will receive additional evaluation points, thereby increasing the likelihood that its project will be funded.

## **V. Consolidated Annual Performance Report (CAPER):**

**N/A**

## VI. Narratives

### Year 1: General Needs and Issues

Through discussions with various local agencies and organizations, public hearings, phone calls/comments from individual citizens, and survey distribution, it appears that affordable, decent housing is a priority need in the City. Related specifically to housing, the following are the most prevalent current needs:

- Rehabilitation of public housing units;
- Transitional housing;
- Demand for single floor rental units for the elderly;
- Demand for 1 and 2 bedroom rental units;
- Elimination of accessibility barriers for elderly and disabled;
- Rental rehabilitation projects to benefit the very lowest-income households, especially large families, and 2-4 person households;
- Additional rent assistance for extremely low-income families;
- Owner-occupied rehabilitation especially for low and extremely low-income households;
- Assistance to low- and moderate-income renters for home purchase; and
- Revitalization of older neighborhoods.

Discussions with various local agencies and organizations, public hearings, phone calls/comments from individual citizens, and survey distribution also indicate a variety of non-housing community development needs. Those of the highest priority are:

- Health Care Services;
- Dental Services;
- Child Care;
- Transportation Services;
- Sidewalks & Pedestrian Infrastructure (especially sidewalk improvements to business districts from elderly / disabled housing units);
- Homeless/Emergency Services
- Job Creation/Retention;
- Recreational Services (especially youth services);
- Parks & Playgrounds;
- Disabled Services; and
- Employment Services & Job Training.

## **Year 1: Description of Actions To Be Taken**

In determining which projects to fund, the City made an effort to address as many of the above needs and issues as possible. The City received \$932,833.95 in funding requests for project year 2005. The City's \$648,000 in CDBG funds will be spent as outlined in the following paragraphs.

In the area of Housing and Property Improvements, the City selected three projects. \$150,000 will be provided to the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority (HRHA) to help procure architectural and engineering services to develop construction and site work documents allowing for the rehabilitation of 40 Public Housing Units in the Harrison Heights Development. This proposal will assist 131 individuals through enhanced living conditions. Valley Associates for Independent Living, Inc. (VAIL) will utilize \$20,000 in CDBG funding and a partnership with Rebuilding Together to complete housing modifications that will remove architectural barriers, making homes accessible; to make emergency repairs; and to provide weatherization for individuals with disabilities who have low to moderate incomes. Gemeinschaft, a six-month residential program for non-violent substance abusing offenders coming out of prison, will use \$15,000 in CDBG funds to assist in the purchase of a house that will be rented to their residents at affordable rates. This housing will be 6-12 month transitional housing for their clients who are being reintroduced into the community and are temporarily unable to secure affordable housing on their own.

The City has chosen to support the following Community and Public Facilities Projects, two of which are being completed through outside agencies, and three of which are City projects. The Roberta Webb Child Care Center will receive \$25,350 for the replacement of the playground fence and playground equipment. Mercy House will receive \$2,600 to improve the quality of security for homeless families by installing 8 interior, date/time stamped security cameras in 3 buildings used as homeless shelters for 12 homeless families, and by placing key pad locks on 6 exterior doors that will automatically lock when closed and will open only when the correct combination of numbers are pressed in sequence. The City will use \$143,000 in CDBG funds for a) Gay Street/North Mason Street traffic lights, b) Morrison Park lights, and c) the Harrison Street sidewalk.

The City will use \$129,600 in CDBG funds for Administration. This will be used for salaries, benefits, office supplies, postage, travel and training, and other administrative costs relating to the block grant program.

Eight Public Services projects have been selected to receive CDBG funding. The Community Association for Rural Transportation (CART) will receive \$19,000 to provide door-to-door service for persons too frail or disabled to get to the curb to use City services, trips at hours the City transit is not operating, trips into the County, out-of-area trips that enable City residents to access health care, and other transportation-related services. The Harrisonburg-Rockingham Free Clinic will receive \$16,500 to provide free medications to low-income, uninsured residents of Harrisonburg. The Boys & Girls Club of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County will receive \$15,000 to expand services to Low and Moderate Income youth, especially Hispanic and other limited English proficient children, in the City of Harrisonburg. They will provide professional supervision, drug abuse and violence prevention training, educational and career-preparatory programming and software, and recreational activities. Training to Achieve Rewarding Careers (TARC), Inc. will receive \$14,000 to provide job readiness classes that will focus both on "hard skills" (e.g., computer literacy, GED, Adult Basic Education, ESOL, CNA training, interviewing skills, and career assessments) and "soft skills" (e.g., work ethic, positive interaction with coworkers and supervisors, respecting diversity, and health literacy). \$14,000 in CDBG funding will be provided to Mercy House for assistance to those who have left the homeless shelter within the last year. Assistance includes emergency financial assistance, mentoring, child care assistance, gas vouchers, bus passes, car repairs, training, and a pilot loan program. The Arc (Association of Retarded Citizens) of Harrisonburg and Rockingham will use \$7,700 in CDBG funding to expand and continue outings



and volunteer activities by purchasing fuel for the vans, insurance, an electronic keyboard for sing-a-longs in nursing homes, books to read to the elderly in nursing homes, other program materials, rent, and van maintenance. The Community Resource Center, in a joint effort with the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority (HRHA), will receive \$6,000 to assist in the development of a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), designed to capture information on the characteristics and service needs of persons experiencing homelessness. And, the Harrisonburg Children's Museum (HCM) will have access to \$5,000 in CDBG funding to provide educational opportunities for identified LMI groups, including migrant farm workers, at-risk preschool classes, LMI families as identified by City elementary school administration, and youth service organizations. Benefits will include free admissions, free memberships, and free or subsidized educational classes.

The last category under which the City will spend CDBG funds is Economic Development. The City will use \$65,250 for eligible economic development projects benefiting low and moderate income persons or eliminating slums and blight. Specific economic development initiatives will be selected in conjunction with the City's Economic Development Office.

For more detailed information on the proposed projects, please refer to the Table 3 worksheets that have been completed for each project.

#### **A. General**

1. Harrisonburg is a city of 17.4 square miles and approximately 42,500 inhabitants. It is located in the geographic center of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. The City is equidistant from Washington, D.C. (124 miles), Richmond, Virginia (116 miles), and Roanoke, Virginia (111 miles). It is a part of the Central Shenandoah Planning District. The community was established in 1780 and became an incorporated city in 1849. The City has a rich history of civic pride, philanthropy, and development. Despite the positive changes experienced by the City, however, there remain areas of unmet need, and a collective desire to see our community improve and prosper to a greater extent.

Harrisonburg is an independent city, which means it is not part of any county. This legal separation of cities and counties is unique to the Commonwealth of Virginia. A city's boundaries can only expand via a court-approved annexation of property from the surrounding county. The last annexation involving Harrisonburg took place in 1983 and allowed the City to more than double in size and recapture some of the population that had shifted to suburban areas. The General Assembly has enacted a moratorium on annexation that is still in effect; therefore, for the 2005-2007 Consolidated Plan, the City considers its boundaries to be fixed.

Map 1, located in Section 2, "Housing (Market Analysis/supply)", indicates the areas of concentration of low and moderate income households.

2. Being in its first-year as an entitlement community, the City has focused on addressing areas of needs versus allocation of funds by geographical area.

3. At this point, the primary obstacle identified in meeting underserved needs would be the financial limitations of the city and the various other agencies attempting to meet those needs.

## ***B. Affordable Housing***

### **1. BASIS FOR ASSIGNING PRIORITY:**

Following the research and data gathering process, the City grouped LMI housing needs by category as follows:

#### **1. Households with incomes 0-30% of median**

##### **A. Small families who are renting and paying more than 50% of their income for rent.**

Reason for priority: Small households at this income level who are paying over 50% of their income for rent are not left with much to cover the additional essential expenses of food, clothing and transportation. Additionally, at this income level, even half of the monthly income is not large in terms of actual dollar amount, which is likely to mean that the property owner is not receiving sufficient cash flow to adequately maintain the rental property.

##### **B. Small families who are renting and paying more than 30% of their income for rent**

Reason for Priority: Small households at this income level who are paying over 30% of their income for rent are not left with much to cover the additional essential expenses of food, clothing and transportation. Additionally, at this income level, even half of the monthly income is not large in terms of actual dollar amount, which is likely to mean that the property owner is not receiving sufficient cash flow to adequately maintain the rental property.

##### **C. Large renter families living in substandard housing**

Reason for Priority: By addressing this category of need, the City not only will assist low-income households to improve their living situation but by improving the condition of the housing stock, will improve neighborhood conditions and stabilize the tax base.

##### **D. Elderly renters paying more than 50% of their income for rent**

Reason for priority: The elderly have no further income-earning potential and therefore few alternatives when faced with disproportionate rents.

##### **E. Elderly renters paying more than 30% of their income for rent**

Reason for priority: The elderly have no further income-earning potential and therefore few alternatives when faced with disproportionate rents.

##### **F. Owners who are paying more than 50% of their income for housing related costs**

Reason for priority: Owners in this income category who are paying over 50% of their income for basic housing related costs do not have any funds available for routine maintenance needed on homes. This problem is especially serious for low-income households, as they are limited by income to purchase older homes, which require more maintenance. This results in unsafe living conditions for members of these households, and it has a negative impact on the appearance of neighborhoods.

## **2. Households with incomes 31-50% of median**

### **A. Elderly renters paying more than 50% of their income for rent**

Reason for priority: The elderly have no further income-earning-potential and therefore few alternatives when faced with disproportionate rents.

### **B. Elderly renters paying more than 30% of their income for rent**

Reason for priority: The elderly have no further income-earning potential and therefore few alternatives when faced with disproportionate rents.

### **C. Owners who are paying more than 50% of their income for housing related costs**

Reason for priority: Owners in this income category who are paying over 50% of their income for basic housing related costs do not have any funds available for routine maintenance needed on homes. This problem is especially serious for low-income households, as they are limited by income to purchase older homes, which require more maintenance. This results in unsafe living conditions for members of these households, and it has a negative impact on the appearance of neighborhoods.

### **D. Owners who are living in substandard housing**

Reason for priority: By addressing this category of need, the City not only will assist low-income owner households to improve their living situation, but by improving the condition of the housing stock, the effect will be to improve the condition of neighborhoods and stabilize the tax base.

## **3. Households with incomes 51-80% of median**

There does not appear to be a significant problem for owners or renters in this income category, thus the City has no plans to make housing related assistance a priority for these owners.

## **2. HOW THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HOUSING MARKET INFLUENCE USE OF FUNDS.**

The proportion of renters to owners has increased over the last decade in Harrisonburg and homeownership affordability is becoming more of an issue. Rental housing remains relatively affordable, although it is becoming more difficult for large family renters. However, some rental units, particularly public housing units are aging and in need of upgrades and improvements. The Harrisonburg

Redevelopment and Housing Authority is taking a very proactive approach in establishing and supporting programs that seek to increase homeownership opportunities in Harrisonburg and that improve and expand the stock of decent affordable privately owned rental housing and public housing. In furtherance of these efforts, the Authority has targeted renovations to existing public housing units as its number one priority. The units in Harrisonburg were all built in the 1960's and have not received any significant renovations since that time. In light of this, the City proposes to allocate funds to the Authority that would allow it to undertake the architectural and engineering design for the renovations, and to assist in funding the renovations themselves. The City and the Authority will also continue to monitor trends in homeownership and privately-owned rental units, and support programs that assist LMI residents in meeting their housing needs.

### **C. Homelessness**

1. *Describe the jurisdiction's strategy for helping low-income families avoid becoming homeless.*

Through data that has been gathered to date, there does not appear to be a problem of existing homelessness, including low income families being threatened with homelessness. The City will continue to work with the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority to assist low income families in meeting their housing needs and will continue to monitor trends and update the data included in the various tables in Section 2 in order to be able to prioritize needs and prevent identified problems from resulting in homelessness.

2. *Describe how the jurisdiction will reach out to homeless persons and address their individual needs.*

As noted in Section 3 / 4, there is not a significant homeless problem in Harrisonburg at this time. However, the City will continue to support agencies and organizations that provide the homeless with temporary and/or transitional housing.

2. *Address the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons.*

Information relative to emergency shelter and transitional needs is addressed in Table 1A.

4. *Describe how the jurisdiction will assist homeless persons to make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.*

The City will continue to work with and through the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the agencies identified in Section 3 / 4 to assist the homeless in transitioning to permanent housing and independent living.

5. *Describe the jurisdiction's Continuum of Care*                      N/A

6. *Describe the nature and extent of homelessness by racial and ethnic groups, to the extent that information is available*

See Section 3 / 4, Tables III-A and III-B.

#### ***D. Other Special Needs (Non-homeless)***

Other non-community development needs identified in the data gathering process included services for the elderly, persons with AIDS/HIV, and the developmentally disabled, and services complimenting or supplementing local law enforcement efforts in crime prevention and focus on at-risk youth. These needs are discussed in more detail in Section III (B)(5) of this Plan and in Table 1B

#### ***E. Non-Housing Community Development Plan***

Public facilities, infrastructure improvements, economic development and planning and administration were noted as the primary needs in this category. These needs are discussed in greater detail in Section III (B)(6) of this Plan and in Table 2B. Public service needs and senior programs are also noted in this section, but are further elaborated upon in Section III (B)(5).

#### ***F. Barriers to Affordable Housing***

1. The City does not feel that it has any public policies that constitute barriers to affordability. The City permits construction of manufactured housing meeting state codes, and the minimum lot size requirement for lots in new subdivisions is not excessively large.

The City has an adequate supply of land in various densities of residential zoning and to meet demand. The City also does not impose excessive development fees for new construction.

#### ***2. Lead-based paint hazards .***

It should be stressed that not all units with lead based paint pose a lead paint hazard. Lead paint presents a health hazard primarily to children under the age of 7 and then mainly when lead paint is not in good condition and housekeeping skills and nutrition are poor. For these reasons, the mere presence of lead based paint in all of the estimated units does not constitute a significant problem in and of itself.

The only way to determine the lead based paint hazard is to test for the presence of lead in household dust, soil, paint, etc, and to evaluate the condition of the paint containing lead. There has been no comprehensive testing for lead hazards in residential properties in the City and therefore, it is not possible to determine the actual lead paint hazard. However, while there have been no incidents of lead poisoning, the Housing Authority has noted that the majority of its public housing units do contain encapsulated lead-based paint which is beginning to show signs of deterioration. This is one of the reasons the authority placed the renovations to existing public housing units as its number one priority.

It is important to note that Harrisonburg is not included on the Virginia Department of Health's listing of "high risk areas" for lead poisoning. The Department's "Prevalence of Elevated Blood Lead Levels and Proportion Tested by Locality of Residence " for children under 72 months, years 2000, 2001, and 2002 listed 3, 1, and 4 children, respectively, as having elevated blood lead levels, but none were above the 10 – 19 MCG/DL range.

### 3. ***Anti-poverty Strategy***

The City does not provide any direct services to reduce the number of households with income below the poverty line. In considering the factors affecting poverty that may be impacted by the existing housing programs of the City, it appears that coordination of production and preservation of affordable housing with supportive programs and services targeted to special needs populations including victims of domestic violence, the physically and mentally handicapped and elderly would benefit this population. In addition, targeted projects such as street and sidewalk improvements, utility replacements and upgrades, and new or upgraded recreational facilities will contribute toward renewed vitality of and pride in affected neighborhoods.

### ***F. Institutional Structure***

The following list includes all agencies that may have a role in addressing identified housing and community development needs in the populations covered in this strategy.

Harrisonburg City Manager's Office: The City office agency providing access to and administration of Federal funds available to cities for the various projects described. The Manager's Office is responsible for the development and implementation of this Consolidated Plan.

Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority: A public housing authority providing rent assistance through HUD certificates and vouchers, management of subsidized housing for the elderly, access to funds for development of transitional housing. The City Council appoints the Board of Directors of this Authority, and the City Council must approve all borrowing of funds and issuing of bonds, etc. However, the City does not provide the Authority with any annual funding allocation, nor does the City provide oversight in regards to hiring, procurement, and contracting. The Authority does comply with all state and federal procurement and other procedures.

Harrisonburg-Rockingham Health Department: The public health agency charged with responding to reports of elevated blood lead level in children and conducting outreach, assessment and education services. Although the state appoints the Director of this agency, the City provides the Department with \$300,000 annually.

City of Harrisonburg Police Department: The Police department has several community-based crime prevention programs including include Community Watch, Auxiliary Police Officers, National Night Out, the Citizens Police Academy and the Weed and Seed Program. The HPD is a City Department and the Chief of Police is hired by the City Manager. The Police Department's budget is \$5,522,000, and funding comes from the City, state funds, and grants. The HPD follows City/VA procurement procedures.

The Salvation Army: The Salvation Army provides financial assistance for rent, utilities and prescriptions. The Salvation Army also has a food pantry, clothing vouchers (used clothing) and in extreme emergencies our agency provides bus tickets. The Salvation Army also provides emergency shelter 24 hours a day. The City provides this organization with \$35,000 annually.

First Step: A private non-profit organization providing emergency shelter for families and individuals who are victims of domestic abuse, counseling, a 24-hour crisis line and programmatic support for residents of transitional housing facilities. The City provides this agency with \$21,000 annually.

Harrisonburg-Rockingham Free Clinic: Free family practice health care is provided to the low income, uninsured of Harrisonburg. Patients are seen by volunteer doctors, nurses, dentists, and other health professionals. The City provides this agency with \$8,500 annually.

Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Department of Social Services: The Social Services structure provides financial aid, housing, transportation, and health assistance to Harrisonburg residents. The City Manager and the Rockingham County Administrator appoint the Director of this agency, and they are the direct supervisors of this person. This agency receives \$1,650,000 annually from the City.

Harrisonburg Boys & Girls Club: The Club provides youth development programs including homework help and tutoring, alcohol and drug abuse prevention, teen pregnancy prevention, conflict resolution, juvenile delinquency prevention, athletics, cultural enrichment, citizenship and leadership development, outdoor and environmental education, and parent training. Boys and Girls Club also offers Hispanic programming. The Club is participating in the renovation of its home site, the Lucy Simms School, which will result in vastly improved facilities for club programs. The building is owned by the City of Harrisonburg. The City provides \$45,000 annually to this organization.

Harrisonburg Department of Public Transportation: Provides transportation for low-income, elderly, and disabled people, as well as the general population of Harrisonburg, along with public school transportation. This is a City Department, and the department head is hired by the City Manager. The budget for this department is \$5,537,000.

Harrisonburg Department of Public Works: Provides sanitation, street and sidewalk repair, maintenance, and construction, traffic planning and control, and stormwater management services in low and moderate income neighborhoods as well as the city in general. This is a City Department, and the department head is hired by the City Manager. The budget for this department is \$5,881,000.

Harrisonburg Department of Public Utilities: Provides water and sewer services, including repair, maintenance and replacement of existing lines, and construction of new lines in low and moderate income neighborhoods, as well as the city in general. This is a City Department, and the department head is hired by the City Manager. The budget for this department is \$11,157,000.

Valley Associates for Independent Living, Inc. (VAIL): VAIL provides vocational and residential placement and support, and educational services to adults who have a documented disability.

Mercy House, Inc.: Mercy House is a transitional housing shelter for homeless families with children. Assistance with clothing, food and counseling is also available.

Community Association for Rural Transportation (CART): The Community Association for Rural Transportation (CART) is a private non-profit transportation provider. They serve low income and elderly riders and riders with disabilities.

ARC of Harrisonburg-Rockingham: The Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC) provides an array of services for persons with mental retardation and their families. services include the ARC Op Shop -- a work activity center for adults with mental retardation; respite care; parent - to - parent assistance, support and information (for parents of all types of special needs children).

Harrisonburg Children's Museum (HCM): HCM is a community-based museum offering a wide range of educational exhibits and programming options for children.

Gemeinschaft Home: Gemeinschaft is a 41 bed residential program that addresses the needs of non-violent ex-offenders and substance abusers coming out of therapeutic community programs inside the Virginia Department of Corrections. It is dedicated to providing an environment where the ex-offender can find support, acquire work and living skills, advance education goals and secure safe and affordable housing.

Roberta Webb Child Care: Roberta Webb child care provides quality, affordable, licensed child care in a safe and nurturing environment. The Webb Center serves children ages 2-5 in the Harrisonburg area. The program is geared toward parents that balance work and/or school with parenting (often with little support).

Training to Achieve Rewarding Careers (TARC), Inc.: TARC is a job training and educational program whose focus is in helping low-income residents overcome barriers to attaining, retaining and advancing in employment.

The City feels that between the continued efforts of those listed above there is sufficient existing basis for addressing any gaps that may be discovered in the existing institutional structure without the City itself creating a new entity to address this issue.

In terms of carrying out activities to address identified housing and community development needs, the City will continue to work directly with the agencies providing these services and related services to better coordinate efforts.

## ***H. Coordination***

The City anticipates continuing its coordination of human service funding with other social service agencies and charitable organizations to better target the limited amount of human service dollars available in the community. The City will also continue to coordinate its housing efforts with the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority.

Economic development activities will continue to be primarily coordinated with the City's economic and community development departments. Redevelopment efforts will be coordinated with local organizations and citizens groups on an ad hoc basis based on the area and impact of proposed redevelopments.

Community facilities improvements and new construction will be coordinated with the City's Parks and Recreation, Public Works and Public Utilities Departments, respectively.



## ***I. Public housing resident initiatives***

Appendix C (attached) includes the Harrisonburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority's 5-Year PHA Plan which outlines resident participation in the planning process and other initiatives of the Authority.

***J. Low income housing tax credit coordination*** N/A

***K. HOME:*** N/A

***L. ESG:*** N/A

***M. HOPWA:*** N/A

## ***N. Monitoring***

Each project supported by the Community Development Block Grant will be monitored carefully by the City to ensure appropriate use of CDBG funds. As a part of their application for funding, all subrecipients are asked to submit an action plan with measurable objectives to be achieved by the following specified dates: September 30, December 31, March 31, and June 30. Quarterly progress reports corresponding with these deadlines (due 14 days after each deadline) will be required for each project receiving grant funds. Quarterly Reports will include, at minimum:

- A description of all project activities that have taken place to date, including all outreach activities and public participation events;
- Photographs of progress to date, if applicable;
- A description of how objectives specified for achievement by that date have been met, OR a description of obstacles that have prevented those objectives from being met, how those obstacles are being addressed, and a new anticipated date of completion for those objectives;
- A description and dollar amount of CDBG funds spent to date, and how much of those funds have already been reimbursed;
- A description and dollar amount equivalent of matching funds (including in-kind) expended to date;
- A description of any anticipated problems or obstacles, and a plan for how those future obstacles will be addressed;
- A description of the **number and qualifying LMI characteristics of persons or households** assisted with CDBG funds to date, such as LMI by household income, homeless, severely disabled, abused children, migrant farm workers, battered spouses, illiterate adults, elderly, or persons living with AIDS; and
- Other supportive information or documentation, as applicable.

The final quarterly report will serve as the final project report, and will include, in addition to items outlined above, a thorough assessment of the project, including successes and weaknesses; a comparison of projected accomplishments and objectives to actual accomplishments and goals achieved, including reasons for any discrepancies between the two; notation of any CDBG funds or matching funds that were not expended and reasons why; total number and qualifying LMI characteristics of persons or households assisted with CDBG funds or other resources leveraged by using CDBG funds, including any matching funds or donations that would not have been received without CDBG assistance; and identification of future related projects that may be eligible for CDBG assistance. This final report will be due 14 days after June 30 or date of final reimbursement, whichever is later.

In addition to these quarterly reports, each recipient will submit periodic requests for reimbursement, no more frequently than once a month, and each request must be for a minimum of \$2,000 or 25% of the total funds awarded, whichever is less. Each reimbursement request must be accompanied by a City request form, documentation of payment for eligible expenses (i.e., invoices, receipts, copies of checks, time sheets, etc.), documentation of matching funds expenditure or donations (i.e., volunteer time logs, time sheets, mock invoices for donated items, etc.), and other supporting documentation.

Each organization receiving funding will be required to maintain records of all project expenses, activities, correspondence, and other information as requested by the City or by HUD, for a period of no less than five years from the date of the final project report. All files and records will be made available during normal business hours and other reasonable times for review by the City or by HUD.

Additionally, Harrisonburg's Block Grant Coordinator will make site visits to inspect the progress of each project and review subrecipient records no less than twice per project during each grant cycle. For all projects requiring building construction or renovation, the City building inspector will make required site visits to ensure that construction/renovation meets City building codes and zoning regulations. Additionally, for construction/renovation projects, including façade improvements, either the City building inspector or City engineer will complete a site inspection prior to reimbursements to ensure that materials for which a reimbursement is requested are in place on the building. **Reimbursements for construction/building materials and façade improvements will only be made once the materials are in place.** A Site Visit Evaluation Worksheet will be completed after each visit by the Block Grant Coordinator, Building Official, or City Engineer, and all worksheets will be maintained in City CDBG files.

As a part of the subrecipient application process, organizations were required to outline a plan for project/program evaluation. Each plan is different and is tailored specifically to the organization's project. During site inspections and quarterly report and records reviews, the City Block Grant Coordinator will confirm that each subrecipient is following their outlined evaluation plan OR the agency will be required to submit an amended evaluation plan to the City, which satisfies City requirements.

The City will also perform any other monitoring activities as prescribed by HUD or as the City deems necessary to ensure full compliance with all CDBG and other federal, state, and local regulations.